

T HE Muck Rake

By Edward Clayson, Sr.

Rooseveltianism

"We will speak out; we will be heard,
Though all earth's systems crack;
We will not bate a single word
Nor take a letter back.

"We speak the truth, and what care we
For hissing and for scorn,
While some faint gleamings we can see
Of freedom's coming morn?

"Let liars fear, let cowards shrink,
Let traitors turn away;
Whatever we have dared to think
That dare we also say."

Cumtux?

The Muck Rake

BY
EDWARD CLAYSON, SR.

CUMTUX?

1908
White & Davis Printing Co
Seattle

HN64
C63

BY TRANSFER
MAY 21 1910

51

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S MESSAGES.

Why?

Neither President Roosevelt nor Candidate William Howard Taft can satisfactorily explain why the Republican party has not done during the past four years what it is promising to do during the next four. The "evils that have crept in" are due to the Republican management and to punish the Republican evil-doers would be against Republican principles.

Lies are good for a short race only. Skilful lies, no matter how skilfully they are clothed by cunning experts with truthful appearances, they cannot stand the light of exposure. Thousands of people will read the above clipping as it appeared in the Sunday Times of the 27th of September, 1908, and thoughtless people will accept its lying insinuations as "confirmation strong as holy writ" until the "studious lies" are pointed out to them. It is a very significant fact that all the traducers of President Roosevelt carefully avoid any reference to his "Famous Message to Congress." Please observe the language above. It says: "Neither President Roosevelt nor Candidate William Howard Taft can satisfactorily explain why the Republican party has not done during the past four years what it is promising to do during the next four." This has a very virtuous sound, has it not? Yet it is mere noise; not a particle of music in it. The "reason why"

more good work was not done than there was, is because the Congress (Democrats and Republicans alike) gave no heed to those urgent, patriotic, statesmanlike messages of President Roosevelt. The corrupt influences of the trusts and the corporations had more influence with that Congress (regardless of what party they were members of) than did the urgent appeals of that valorous man, President Roosevelt, in his messages. **That is why!** And every intelligent man who will stop and think for a moment knows the why as here presented. The trusts and the corporations have felt the vigorous, virtuous, valorous hand of President Roosevelt and they fear him, and they view with mistrust the man that he supports for President of the United States, as they **know from experience** that he, Taft, means what he says when he declares that the "Rooseveltian principles" will be maintained if he is elected. The trusts and the corporations also know the "peerless one from Nebraska." They do not fear him, for he is as fluctuating and as unreliable as his peers, the rostrum-hunting political Amazons, who have also discovered him. Time and again have we declared that "character is worth more to a nation than education." W. J. Bryan is characterless.

SHAMEFUL.

The whole moral world today is put to shame when it witnesses the heinousness and the strenuous efforts of national blackguards and hireling demagogues to besmire the personal and

unimpeachable character of President Roosevelt. This is not political partisanship (it is inflamed by political partisanship, of course); it is moral partisanship. There are as many degenerate Republicans as there are Democrats who would like to see the moral prestige of this virtuous man Roosevelt destroyed, in order that audacious infamy may become pre-eminent and permanent. This intense spirit of wickedness against virtue is the same that assassinated Caesar; it crucified Christ, it sent Danton to the guillotine and it assassinated President Lincoln. Hypocrisy is the father of it, Cant is the mother of it. "Until Cant ceases nothing else can begin." America today needs a **powerful peacemaker**. It is not peace and humiliation which should be tolerated, but peace associated with dignity and truthfulness which we **must** have. It were better far that we have war to the knife, and the knife to the hilt, than to submit to a shameful, humiliating, degenerating peace with demagogues in politics and hypocrites in church in the ascendancy, and national blackguards with ill-gotten pelf dominating the whole people. The American Pharoah has evidently "hardened his heart," and has determined to frustrate the holy efforts of the American Moses, whose name is not W. J. Bryan.

Be sure you're right, then go ahead is the motto of old David Crockett, and this motto shows itself in President Roosevelt. The mouthings of the designing tools of the trusts and corporations notwithstanding. President Roosevelt is charged by the degenerate rabble with

being impulsive and thoughtless, of "rushing in" without being considerate. This infamous lie is started in Wall Street, New York, and is echoed and re-echoed all along the line by fools, knaves and degenerates generally. The fact of the matter is that President Roosevelt was both thoughtful and deliberate, for he called together the wisest and most impartial men in the nation and discussed the matter of Foraker and Haskell thoroughly before taking the important step which he did. Then, like old David Crockett, he was sure he was right and went ahead. **More power to him!** Everyone in Seattle knows that the writer of this, the editor of this paper, is not a Republican, but by the living God he is a "Rooseveltian," which is a superior standard to that of being a Republican, for all Republicans are not Rooseveltians (Foraker, for instance). They are loyal to their party, but they have not all of them a full comprehension of the grandeur of the man who has carried their banner for the past seven years, and has added more strength to their party and dignity to the American people than any other man who has occupied the office of Chief Magistrate of the United States for the past forty years. To be able to add my best efforts toward the support of such a great man as President Roosevelt is the greatest pleasure of my public life. The slogan of ward politician has been put into the mouths of the thoughtless rabble. This is supposed to belittle the man who has fought so strenuously for uprightness. Yes, he has gone into the

wards, if you will, with the muck-rake, and has exposed the mucksters to the noonday sun, and they are all squirming, for they are now admitted to full membership in "The Found Out Club." Every hypocrite in church or demagogue in politics or quack doctor or "cuckold-maker" in court (whether in breeches or petticoats), race suiciders, criminal limit hens, dopesters, prohibitionists, woman suffragists—being as they are the offal of the domestic hearth and the refuse of the political dunghill—are all (in their mutual degeneracy) gnashing their heathenish teeth and are wagging their lying tongues in a general chorus at the man who is determined to take them out of the bondage which they seem to enjoy. Here is a picture presented by the poet of "**Roosevelt the Deliverer**" and the degenerate rabble who strive to oppose him: "But what more oft in nations grown corrupt,
And by their vices brought to servitude,
Than to love bondage more than liberty,
Bondage with ease, than strenuous liberty;
And to despise, or envy, or suspect
Whom God hath of His special favor raised
As their deliverer; if he aught begin,
How frequently to desert him, and at last,
To heap ingratitude on worthiest deeds?"

EDWARD CLAYSON, SR.

With no apologies to make.

TOM WATSON'S CLOTHES.

Demagogue Bryan charges President Roosevelt with having "stolen his clothes." In the meantime the rightful owner, Tom Watson,

says, "They are my clothes, which you two mercenaries are contending for," and Tom Watson is right as usual. This contention for Tom Watson's clothes amongst four aspirants—Roosevelt, Bryan, Hisgen, Debs—reminds me of the story of the four Roman soldiers who crucified Christ. The story reads:

"Then the soldiers, when they had crucified Jesus, took His garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part; and also His coat: now the coat was without seam, woven from the top throughout. They said, therefore, among themselves: Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be."—St. John xix. 23-24.

These four political soldiers—Roosevelt, Bryan, Hisgen, Debs—have "cast lots" for Tom Watson's coat and Roosevelt has won it, whilst the other three have divided Tom Watson's garments between them. Now Roosevelt likes Tom Watson's coat, and wears it with considerable pride, but it does not fit him very well. The political tailor has trimmed off some of the essential parts of Our Tom's coat, but they left the ornaments complete, so that the "Populist uniform" is not disguised at all, and Roosevelt will not disgrace this uniform, nor disguise it. The other three—Bryan, Hisgen and Debs—are wearing Tom Watson's under garments, which are never exposed to view. "Tom Watson's clothes" are very simply made, but they are of the most stable material, hence their great attractiveness to the Democratic multitude. Cumtux?

DEBS & CO., MORALISTS?

The "slave-makers," who are ever watchful,

observing that the "socialist party" was lagging, and that the "deluded" were in danger of returning to common sense, they are again "booming Debs"; they boom him by telegraph, they boom him with their hireling press (cautiously), they boom him with "special cars" fitted up in the most luxurious style. He is an American nabob, serving the nabobs, as they made him a nabob, as a reward for his labors in their behalf. As a populist they made him a martyr; as a socialist they made him a hero. The "undiscerning workingman" is carried away with the "oratorical gab" of Debs, instead of observing his actions. "Actions speak louder than words." Ye fools, don't you know that? Show me the kind of company you keep, and I will tell you the kind of a man you are. But then, what is the secret motive of Debs? It is one of those things that are known but cannot be proven. This great national demagogue is a very able man. He is much abler than Demagogue Bryan, for Debs can preach "eternal truth" to fools, and the greater the truth the greater the deception, for he preaches "true ideals," which he and the "slave-makers" whom he serves know quite well can never be put into actual practice. "Socialism in politics is a parallel of Christianity in religion, being a beautiful ideal to teach but impossible to practice. I doubt if there is a true Christian on the face of the whole earth. The Socialist party affords a place for the "imaginative and impractical"; it also affords

a field for unscrupulous agitators to make an easy living by "working the workingman." These agitators occupy about the same mendicant position in politics as the Salvation Army captains do in religion. They are both endowed with more insolence than moral principles, and they would both sooner "gab than work." By keeping these gabsters employed at "gabbing" and keeping a "party" for them to center in, where they can air their stupid ambitions and work off their steam for the edification of gaping fools of both sexes, they are kept out of danger, for should their minds be turned into "sensible channels" and their ambitions centered upon honest practical work in public interests they might become dangerous to the "special privileged" aristocratic usurpers, so graphically denounced by Tom Watson, who are now using them for their own ends. Here is what a celebrated reformer says about the Socialists:

Has an Economic Plumb Line.

To the Editor of the North American: Every American citizen should be opposed to abolishing the constitutional right "of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." Every true American should stand for honest discussion, verbal and printed, on governmental problems. Our motto should be fair field and no favor; let us aid every true development judiciously, heartily. Socialists vociferously demand the right of free assemblage, but they craftily conceal the fact that they most vitally abuse this glorious American privilege; and subtly lead many of our citizens astray by their propaganda of untruth, half truth and of devious conception. Socialists will not

permit, in their meetings, and in their publications, the fair play which they pretend to stand for. I challenge them to be accurate. Unless they are accurate they are neither scientific nor honest. What is the exact economic end which they wish to attain? By what plan or plans do they expect to attain and maintain this specific end? If socialistic leaders are honest, they will furnish the foregoing essential information, or desist from their deceptive propaganda. Our people are suffering frightful economic distress. Able socialistic leaders, who prostitute their abilities, can naturally sway and lead many of our citizens astray. These socialistic leaders should stand forth and demonstrate their ability to truly elucidate our economic perversion. If they decline to be specific, then American citizens should resolutely turn away from "blind leaders of the blind." Unless we turn away from deceptive guile and seek after eternal truth in practical form, I fear that our nation is lost. Standard Oil Chancellor Day, of the Syracuse University, told the Methodist ministers of Philadelphia to avoid social ethics in their sermons. Mr. Day warned them against the newspapers of our land. If our ministers are so ungodly that they will not earnestly discuss righteous political, economic and judicial systems, I hope that The North American will accept Chancellor Day's plutocratic challenge and ever keep its columns open for the impartial, logical, common-sense discussion of the foregoing most vital themes. One more elemental economic question to the blatant socialistic revolutionists: Has God (nature) failed to provide specific and relevant test of the uprightness of human economic government? Not any of us desire to live in a house which is, physically, out of plumb. We all know that our governments, national, state and local, are sadly out of plumb; otherwise our people would not suffer so frightfully while we are in the midst of plenty, for nature (God) has been bountiful. Where is the immediate, practical and effective remedy? Humanity suffers, and if our profoundly learned socialists evade

direct and most relevant questions, they are factors in producing and maintaining the frightful specters of idleness, suffering and debasement which stalk through our beloved land. EDWARD STERN.

Philadelphia, March 8, 1908.

The great lesson for America to learn is "temperance," not prohibition. The man who drinks moderately, whether in a saloon or in his own house, is the true "temperance" man. The public have been so continually stuffed with this wretched philosophy that they consider "temperance and prohibition" as being one and the same thing. They are as far apart as frugality and gluttony. The drunkard dies a premature death with "delerium tremens," and the glutton dies before his time with the "gout," whilst "temperance" in drinking and frugality in eating lives long and enjoyable lives. "Be ye temperate in all things," says St. Paul.

SALOONKEEPER TURNS TABLES ON CRUSADERS.

JACKSON, Mich.—The crusaders today visited the saloon of Ed Shafer, formerly a Lutheran preacher, and prayed fervently for the Lord to convince him of his great sin and lead him to abandon his nefarious business. When they had finished he arose, closed his eyes heavenward and offered up the following prayer:

"O God, thou who madest the heavens and the earth and created man in thine own image; thou who didst teach thy servant Noah to make

and use wine; thou who doth command in thy holy word—‘Drink, yea, drink abundantly,’ ‘Drink thy wine with a merry heart,’ ‘Let him drink and forget his poverty,’ ‘Give wine unto those that be of heavy hearts,’ and ‘Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach’s sake and thine often infirmities.’ We also read in thy word how Jesus did convert water into wine, showing plainly that he considered wine better than water for man to drink, and how he chose wine instead of water as the emblem of his blood, and commanded his followers to forever drink it in commemoration of him. We also find that thy servant, Martin Luther, the great reformer, did say: ‘He who loves not women, wine and song, remains a fool his whole life long.’

“O Lord, we pray thee to have pity upon these women who rebel against thy word, and who are not grateful to thee for thy precious gifts, and who dress extravagantly, and drive their husbands to overwork, to drink, to dishonesty, to bankruptcy, to crime and to suicide. They adorn their costly headgear with the bodies of innocent birds, whose sweet lives were wickedly sacrificed to feed their cruel vanity. They wear not the complexion thou providest them with, but compress their 36-inch waist into 16-inch corsets. They wear false hair, store teeth, tight shoes and bustles, and pad their bosoms with moss, cotton and steel springs.

“O God, thou knowest that crusading women generally have drunken husbands or sons, made so by unhappy homes, or husbands with

feeble minds who meekly submit to the authority of their wives and hide behind their skirts. O Lord, have mercy upon such women, who bring disgrace and humiliation upon their families, and do not punish them according to their deserts, but constrain them to not be gadding brawlers, but, as commanded in thy word, 'to be discreet keepers at home, obedient to their husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed,' and to pluck the beams out of their own eyes before they sally forth with hatchets and prayers and with exhortations and epithets to remove the motes from the eyes of their neighbors.

“O God, teach these women to realize that they are making fools of themselves. Convince them that violence will not promote temperance, but that it will beget violence and retaliation and leads to evils infinitely greater than the evil they seek to remove. Teach them that the only temperance acceptable to thee is that which proceeds from the heart and is voluntary self control. That hatchet temperance, like padlock virtue, shotgun honor and sheriff honesty, is a stench in thy sight.

“O God, give us all wisdom to study deeply thy moral law and to comprehend thy will, and may all the temptations and trials of life prove a means of grace to fit us for the life beyond. Teach us to realize the great truth where there is no cross there is no crown; that without temptation there can be no virtue. Fill our hearts with love and our heads with wisdom, finally

receive us into thy Heavenly kingdom, and thine shall be the glory forever. Amen.”

Some of the ladies took offense at the prayer before it was half finished and tried vigorously to get out of the saloon, but the pack of humanity refused to give way and compelled them to remain and hear it out. The crusaders appeared to feel crestfallen and beaten at their own game, and the episode seems to have completely turned the tables on them in Jackson. Their crusade gun, like the old army musket, did more execution at the breech than at the muzzle.—Leavenworth Times.

THE BREWERS' PLATFORM.

The promotion of temperance in connection with the use of fermented beverages—the meaning of temperance being neither abuse nor disuse, is favored by the United States Brewers' Association in a lengthy set of principles the association adopted at its closing session. These principles pledge the men representing \$1,000,000,000 of capital, to “clean house,” so that even a prohibitionist cannot find fault. The declaration is also a protest by the brewers that they have not permitted sordid gains to influence them in supporting low resorts. They maintain that politics has done them more harm than good, and that they will prove by future action that they are both law-abiding and law-loving.

The allied trades having to do with work for the brewing interests, organized to help the larger body fight the prohibition movement. The new organization will be known as the United States Manufacturers and Merchants' Association. Many millions of dollars are invested in these trades, and the “personal liberty” demand springs from them. The platform adopted is in part:

“The United States Brewers' Association, in convention assembled, presents the following declarations of principles, and declares its sympathy with.

and offers its co-operation with any movement looking to the promotion of habits of temperance in the use of fermented beverages. By temperance is meant temperate use—neither abuse or disuse. We believe that the temperate use of beer promotes health and happiness, which are the underlying conditions of morality and social order, and in this belief we are supported by the vast preponderance of educated as well as popular opinion all over the world.

“It is a mistake to believe that the commercial interest of the brewers stands back of the excessive multiplication of saloons or of any of the unlawful or improper practices resorted to by a small minority of saloonkeepers to swell their incomes, such as keeping open after hours, selling to minors or drunkards, encouraging or tolerating gambling and the social evil in connection with their places.

“The existing evils, however, can be eradicated by action on the part of individuals in the trade only if they are aided and supported by public sentiment and suitable laws which will make it possible for a small number of people who may not wish to abide by the concerted action of the majority of the trade to make such action futile. The brewers are ready and anxious to do their share, to co-operate to the extent of their power in the work of eliminating abuses connected with the retail trade. While repudiating the charge that theirs is the chief responsibility for the existence of such abuses, they ask the co-operation of the public and of the proper authorities in the work of making the saloon what it ought to be—a place for wholesome refreshment and recreation.

“The brewer is charged with being in politics and using political power for the purpose of influencing legislation, paralyzing executive action and protecting the disorderly saloon. Such statements are grossly exaggerated and highly colored. Rather is it true that the existence of disorderly saloons is in many cases the work of a certain class of politicians who keep them alive for their own purposes and in opposition to the wishes of the brewers. With suitable laws properly enforced and backed by healthy public sentiment such disorderly saloons could be exterminated, and not only the community purified of objectionable

places, but the brewing trade freed of an incubus which it is now struggling to shake off without such assistance. No one would hail such a consummation with greater satisfaction than the brewer.

"If the brewers have been driven into politics it is due to the intemperate attacks upon them along political lines, and we ask the public to bear in mind that self-preservation is a very elementary instinct.

"We turn with confidence to the fair-minded American public and ask it if, in view of many practical instances of our sincerity given in the face of great difficulties, to consider the statements above made and to accept our assurance that the objectionable features of the retail liquor traffic do not rest upon and are not backed, either by the commercial interests or by any supposed political power of the brewers, but that the elimination of such objectionable features is most most earnestly desired by our trade, that we will lend our fullest co-operation toward their extinction, and invite the assistance of public officials and the people in general to that end."—*Pacific Wine and Spirit Review*.

THE STORY OF BEER.

The birth of beer occurred before the dawn of history. It was brewed by the Iberian aborigines of Spain, and it is brewed today by tribes in Darker Africa. The story of beer is that of the human race. Gambrinus was the legendary discoverer of beer in its better sense. Who was Gambrinus? Some say the name is a corruption of Jan Primus, Duke of Brabant, who did not disdain to be portrayed holding a tankard. Others believe the name to be that of some mythical, beneficent saint who gave the amber nectar to mortals. Beer is more than a beverage—it is a civilization, says a writer in *Harper's Weekly*. There are two races, and only two, which rule the world today—the wine-oil race and the butter-beer race. The line of demarkation is clear and clean; it runs along the northern boundary of the wine lands. The Russians, Germans, Scandinavians, Belgians, English and people of northeast France belong to the butter-beer race; the people of the Mediterranean littoral to the wine-oil. All drinking terms run through all languages with little disguise. Thus

"wine" comes to us almost unchanged through Latin, Greek and Hebrew. "Mead" has a similar history. "Whisky" goes back to the Celtic "usquebaugh," because the Celts invented the science of distillation, or at least first adopted it from the Arabians.—Pacific Wine and Spirit Review.

KNIGHTS OF THE ROYAL ARCH.

Seattle Lodge No. 58.

E. L. James, Recorder, 1265 First Avenue South
SEATTLE, Wash., Aug. 29th, 1908.

Editor The Patriarch,
Seattle, Wash.

Dear Sir: Our local press on several recent occasions has printed news items regarding the Royal Arch organization, from which the inference has been drawn that the Royal Arch is a secret association of saloon keepers, organized for selfish interests, and to propagate underground work against the forces of law and order. Such is far from being the case. The Royal Arch is a national organization working on the assumption that the sale of wines, spirits and beer is a legitimate business, which if properly conducted is not inimical to the living of a sober, godly and righteous life, and still less a hindrance to local or national progress. On the other hand, the Royal Arch concedes that the liquor business as it has sometimes been conducted in the past, and in some instances unfortunately in the present, is not a respectable business, and is open to very serious criticism. It is to remedy these conditions that the society is organized. The Royal Arch is nothing more nor less than an organization of men engaged in the same business. mutually

anxious to improve the standing of their business in the community, and banded together to the end that by their combined power and influence they may compel all men engaged in that business to obey the law, and so conduct their business that it shall neither be a cause of stumbling, nor a means of offense to the good citizen.

Unfortunately, it has often happened that men of ill-repute have, by misrepresentation, obtained saloon licenses, and have conducted disreputable resorts in defiance of law and morals, leaving legitimate saloon keepers to bear the brunt of a perfectly justified outraged public opinion.

The Royal Arch will not admit such men into its membership, and will strive, side by side with the forces of good government and social purity, to drive such men out of business, and their houses out of existence.

The other day one of our daily papers printed a story to the effect that the Royal Arch had organized a systematic boycott of all business men who had signed petitions against the recent granting of liquor licenses. On behalf of the Royal Arch we can, and do officially deny the truth of that story. To present the individual saloon keeper from looking askance at a brother business man actively engaged in the work of ruining the saloon man's business, is to ask the impossible. So long as human nature is what it is, Smith is not likely to do business with Jones, if Jones is trying to hurt Smith's business. But that has nothing to do with the

Royal Arch. In brief, what other men's secret organizations do for the boosting of prices, the Royal Arch does for the boosting of morals, and the improvement of the liquor business generally. Surely no fault can be found with the aims of such an organization, and unless a man believes that the liquor business per se is criminal, his best wishes will certainly be for the success of our organization. Very respectfully yours,

J. E. L. JAMES,

Recorder, Knights of the Royal Arch.

ROOSEVELT VS. THE SOCIALISTS.

Judging from the angry replies of prominent Socialists, President Roosevelt must have struck home in the address in which he recently paid his respects to socialism in the following words:

“We have made this country what it is partly because we have measurably succeeded in securing in the past equality of opportunity. That is very different from equality of reward. I believe emphatically in doing everything that can be done by law or otherwise to keep the avenues of occupation, of employment, of work, of interest so open that there shall be, so far as it is humanly possible to achieve it, a measurable equality of opportunity; equality of opportunity for each man to show the stuff that is in him. But when it comes to reward, let him get for his energy, foresight, intelligence, thrift, courage he is able to get if the opportunity opens. I don't believe in coddling any-

one. I would no more permit the strong to oppress the weak than to tell a weak man or a vicious man that he ought by rights to have the reward due only to the man who actually earns it. Very properly we in this country set our faces against privilege. There can be no grosser example of privilege than that set before us as an ideal by certain socialistic writers—the ideal that every man shall put into the common fund what he can, which would mean what he chose, and should take out whatever he wanted; in other words, this theory is that the man who is vicious, foolish, a drag on the whole community, who contributes less than his share to the common good, should take out what is not his, what he has not earned, that he shall rob his neighbor of what that neighbor has earned. This particular socialistic ideal would be to enthrone privilege in one of its grossest, crudest, most dishonest, most harmful and most unjust forms. Equality of opportunity to render a service—yes, I will do everything I can to bring it about. Equality of reward—no, unless there is also equality of service. If the service is equal let the reward be equal; but let the reward depend on the service; and mankind, being composed as it is, there will be inequality of service for a long time to come, no matter how great the equality of opportunity may be, and just as long as there is inequality of service it is eminently desirable that there should be inequality of reward.”—Tacoma Forum.

BEER, COMMERCE AND MORALITY.

The Seattle Spirit.

Carrying beer enough to quench the thirst of every man, woman and child in a city of about six times the size of Greater Seattle, the steamship Watson sailed yesterday afternoon for San Francisco. She had a full cargo of freight, including the largest single consignment of beer ever shipped from this port. She also carried a full passenger list, including a number of racing men and track horses. There were 750 tons of beer in the hold of the Watson when she left port about 1 o'clock. It was in the shape of 460 hogsheads, 1,200 barrels, 700 half barrels, 150 third barrels, 900 quarter barrels and 120 casks of bottled beer, making in all 29 carloads. The beer was largely of local manufacture. As there are thirty gallons to each barrel and sixty-three gallons to a hogshead, it is figured that the Watson carried in round numbers 100,000 gallons or 400,000 quarts of beer. Conservative judgment places about four drinks to each quart, making a total of 1,600,000 glasses of beer.—Seattle Times.

The true Seattle Spirit feels a pride in all that is represented in the above commercial triumph; but hypocrisy will in its insolence make faces at it. The true moralist feels as great a gratification at that "large cargo" of "temperance beverage" going forth from this port as the commercial man does. Why should he not? Seattle sends to San Francisco a large cargo of excellent beer, and San Francisco responds by sending us a large cargo of wine and brandy. This mutual exchange represents a commercial transaction in keeping with the highest triumphs in civilized life, and not in conflict with the highest standards of morality. Now let "The Royal Raymond Degenerates" of the

Anti-Saloon League view this wholesome production of the barley, the hops and the grape, and compare it with the "spirits of wine" and drugs used to make prohi hypocrites drunk with their infamous compound, which is "unlawfully and shamefully" peddled from "blind pig sneak holes and drug stores," where the product of the breweries and wineries and the distilleries are excluded, and maintain their villainous position in the presence of honest, upright men if they can. The wholesome products of the barley, the hops, the grape and the corn are a blessing to the highest standards of civilized life, not a curse. Alcoholic beverages are fit for highly civilized people only, not for savages. The moment a savage comes in contact with it it kills him, because he is "intemperate"; he is the peer of the prohibitionist in this respect and needs protection against his own depraved appetite and his own weak mind,

COLLIER'S ONE HUNDRED DOLLAR PRIZE.

"The Saloon in Our Town."

Last March Collier's offered a one hundred dollar prize for the best article presented to them upon the subject of "The Saloon in Our Towns." The article to be confined to one thousand words or less. The editor of this paper competed for this prize. Here is my matter upon the subject:

Seattle, Wash., March 6, 1908.
To the Editor of Collier's, New York.

Gentlemen: "The Saloon in Our Town" is

an interesting subject just now; in discussing this subject I wish to make a few comparisons. "Comparisons are odious," but truthful comparisons are never odious to virtuous men.

To begin with, I wish to say that "American liberty" was born in a saloon, the "Raleigh Tavern," a place where they "sold rum," was the place of all others where the voice of Patrick Henry was heard denouncing the oppressor, and the churches of Virginia were against the liberty-loving Americans and with their oppressor, King George the Third; and we must not forget in discussing this matter that in the matter of drinking it was "rum" whiskey or nothing with the American forefathers. Their drinking place did not furnish them with light wines and beers, lemonade, etc., etc., with which the "modern saloon" is equipped.

When the Prohibitionists first began their crusade, some sixty-odd years ago, in America the whiskey bottle was found in nearly every household, and the "modern saloon" was almost unknown except in the very largest cities. The Prohibitionists drove the liquor out of the household, and up sprang the "modern saloon" and the "patent medicine" knave, both being a product of Prohibition philosophy. In regard to "patent medicines," I wish to say that it has been proven by the most reliable authority that the most popular "patent medicine" is that which contains the most alcohol.

I came to Puget Sound forty-three years ago, and for many years we had no steamer whatever touching Puget Sound from the outside

world. The "rude saloon" was our central place of resort amidst rude but honest companionship; our only alcoholic drink was Hudson Bay rum, a contraband article from Victoria, B. C., and some cheap bitters and still cheaper American whiskey. This was the limit of our "wine list" for many years. At length a brewery was built. This was a Godsend, although it was a very coarse beer in comparison to the fine beers we get now. The building of the first brewery on Puget Sound was the beginning of "temperance" on Puget Sound. I am talking from the record of "personal experience," and not from the writings of some irresponsible "penny-a-liner" who has come into our midst since the advent of the railroads to Puget Sound.

I wish to point out that where the saloons **are not** is the place of all others that the roar goes up against them, and in the locations where **they are** there is but very little complaint against them. Corroborative of this assertion, I point to this city of a quarter of a million inhabitants, with fourteen wards and 315 saloons. The saloons are confined to five wards in the business part of the city. At a city election held here four years ago the Prohibition vote in the Ninth ward, which is three miles away from any saloon, was nearly double that of the total Prohibition vote of all five of the saloon wards put together, and yet there are precincts in some of these saloon wards whose population is double that of the whole Ninth ward. There is no doubt but some large

towns and cities have been carried upon this unjust basis for Prohibition. If this is the standard of Prohibition ethics, then I must say that they are sober, industrious and depraved; their aims are not to enhance the spirit of equity or morality, but to promote "cunning," which President Roosevelt so emphatically says must be "shackled." The patrons of the saloon do not cultivate "cunning," for alcoholic drink liberates the tongue. "Cunning" is the feminine part of the devil, and is found more often in the pulpit than in the saloon. I find that the most prominent of all Prohibitionists are they who never set foot inside of a saloon, so in reality he knows nothing whatever about them; so, having to depend upon others for their data, they promulgate their impressions by proxy, as it were, and this leads to falsification, but having been taught for so many years by the ignorant and presumptuous that Prohibition is a virtue, he always mistakes his insolence and his arrogance for dignity. He is "drunken but not with wine," as the prophet Isaiah says.

A very stupid law is that which prevents any saloon from being established within "three miles of a state university," lest the students might become corrupted, so we treat them just as we do the irresponsible Indians, putting them on a government reservation and making them wards of the government instead of trusting to their manhood and their own personal accountability. This is a good way to breed "sissies."

Another comparison to make in this line of thought is that of the English railroads and our own railroads. At every English railroad station of any note there is the saloon right in the station, belonging to the railroad company. There you can buy all the liquor you please, whether you are a passenger or whether you are an employe of the railroad company. At American railroad stations there are no saloons whatever, and yet we kill upon our lines more than a hundred to one on the English lines, and they make as good time as we do, and pass through a more thickly settled country than we do, and they get all the beer and spirits they choose to buy right there at the railroad station, whilst at our railroad stations you can get none. What will the Prohibitionist do with this lesson?

Another comparison occurs to my mind. In this port we often have here both American and English warships. In the American navy no liquor is served to either officers or crew; in the English navy they have "rum" served out to them every day, and the ships carry a "canteen" as well, furnished with beer, which is sold to all who wish to buy for their private use of an evening after the duties of the day are ended, but if any of the crew "gets drunk" his "rum" is stopped and his "canteen privileges" are suspended for a time as a punishment. When these crews come on shore, I find that the "rum" and "beer drinking" Englishmen are better behaved in every respect than are our own men-of-warshipmen. The saloon is a

greater attraction to the American when he gets on shore than it is to the English, so he generally drinks too much, whilst the Britisher, who gets all he wants on board ship, does not get drunk, for the reason that the liquor is neither a treat nor a novelty to him.

I could present a few more useful comparisons, but the limit of "one thousand words" is reached.

Respectfully submitted by
EDWARD CLAYSON, SR.

COLLIER'S THE NATIONAL WEEKLY
418 West 13th St., New York.

Dear Sir: We beg to return herewith the enclosed manuscript, which we regret we are unable to use.

We wish to say, however, that rejection does not in any way reflect upon the value of the manuscript, and that it is not necessarily unavailable for use in other periodicals. It simply indicates that the matter is not suited for the present needs of Collier's.

Yours truly,
THE EDITORS.

It will be observed that this letter is "not dated," but the envelope in which this note was enclosed bears the postoffice stamp of April 21, New York. The note also states, as you will observe, that "the matter is not suited for the present needs of Collier's." The **present needs**, remember. This implies that **future**

needs of Collier's are uncertain. They are evidently waiting to see which way the political wind blows, and they will then trim their sails to the wind. Collier's are very wise, but not very brave.

COWBOY PREACHER VS. EDITOR OF THE PATRIARCH.

Sailor vs. Cowboy.

As most of our readers know, we "bearded the lion in his den" last Saturday evening, or, in other words, we met the "Cowboy Preacher," who turned out to be a bellowing calf, in his tent, and not a lion. As a humanitarian physician will always minister to the sick and destitute "without pay," so will I "administer to a mind diseased" without pay, but in the present instance it is like "throwing pearls before swine," although a hog will give a grunt of recognition occasionally, if not of gratitude, to the man who feeds him, but not a "woman" suffrage or a prohibition hog. This tortuous rabble wearing the uniform of a **traitorous son and daughter** without blush, conducting their infamous orgies amidst their peers, grinning Japs and nigger wenches—the **converted**—conducted as they are and manipulated by a "Cowboy Preacher," presents a motley group of degenerates, not to be met with in any other part of the earth but Seattle, the Terminal City of the World. This "uniformed rabble," the trumpeter's brigade who are branded with the ignominious stamp of Judas, in order to demon-

tsrate their superior standard of morals, and echo the depraved sentiments of the "Cowboy Preacher" at the same time, did, during the "debate" continually echo and re-echo that stupid effeminate monotone in a very audible voice, for the purpose of showing that they were "loil" to the good cause, exclaim: "**Hi wonder hif 'e 'ad a mother?**" This stupid exclamation is the very acme of wisdom and virtue with the "woman suffragists." It represents their full capacity for either mental or moral receptivity; they are legitimate prey for a "Cowboy Preacher," and are objects of pity and contempt to the moral philosopher. "**I wonder if he had a mother.**" Yes, he, **Ballington Booth**, and **Maud**, his degenerate wife, who deserted and played the traitor to both his "Father and his Mother," in order to serve the Devil in Hell; he, the Judas of the Booth family, that he is, put himself at the head of the most degenerate mob of self-seekers in America, and his latest acquisition is the "Cowboy Preacher," who I should judge by his own confessions of early training, landed in a theological college instead of the penitentiary. This bovine bunco bullcon peddler was the clown of the circus at the "debate" last Saturday evening, and like the clown, whose office it is to entertain the "silly portion" of the audience, but is incapable of taking any part in the more skilful exercises of the performers, who attract the thoughtful and the intellectual. The bellying of this "**Ballington Booth Bilk**," the "Cowboy Preacher," intimates very strongly

that he is a "Cowboy," and that he never tasted the "milk of human kindness" from a loving mother's breast in his life, but was fed from a rubber sucking bottle filled with "Bovine Juice," hence his "fierceness," showing that he has imbibed the brutal qualities of his foster mother the "Cow." All names have some fundamental origin of their progenitors, and it now appears that the foundation of a modern family of brutes is about to be made by the name of "Cowboy," and if they become the true type of Sam. Bettes, the quadruped parts of their anatomy will be one-half bovine, one quarter baboon and the biped part, the other quarter, will be poltroon. This description forms the fundamental mongrelism of the "Cowboy" himself as exemplified at the "debate," for the moment that he quit bellowing like a cow he at once assumed the antics of the baboon, and when he attempted to be serious he at once became a poltroon. The "plagiarizing Cowboy Preacher" at this "debate" never uttered one single original idea; not one! His was merely a re-hash of meaningless gab and noise, mistaken by fools for music, which has been doing service for degeneracy under the title of "woman suffrage" and prohibition for the past forty years. "Sam the Cowboy," in his plagiarisms, says: "I accept it as a fact that a man who does not know a transitive verb from a rat-hole has the right to talk of the saloon as an educator." We second the motion, Sammy, and admit that he may be in an unwarranted position as an educator, but he may

be at the same time a keen observer and a true moralist, who knows instantaneously the "transient knave" from the permanent gentleman. I had entertained the hope that I was to meet a man of knowledge at that "debate," where my time might have been spent to advantage to myself, if nothing more; but alas, I was sorely disappointed in this, for I learned literally nothing, as the "Cowboy's" side was nothing but "tinkling cymbals and sounding brass," which was presented in the "bass clef" (as the "Cowboy" could not get away from nature entirely). But his tune was entirely in the "treble clef," so you see his standard of discord. You cannot sing bass and treble at the same time. "Discord" is disorder, and "order is heaven's first law," whilst disorder is hell's first triumph. The "Cowboy Preacher" is reaching out for disorder and hell as fast as he knows how, but I do not wish him to reach his destiny via Seattle. The "Seattle Spirit" is already overburdened with corruption, and as it was the "last straw which broke the camel's back," we cannot afford to carry the corrupt burden of the "Cowboy Preacher" on and on to his hellish, effeminate destiny. As "public discussion is the bulwark of liberty," so does "silence give consent." Silence enables the "muck breeder" to continue propagating his muck, but "public discussion" is the muck raker who exposes the roots of the "muck breeder" to the noonday sun, which at once enfeebles the muckers, if it does not destroy

them. The "Keg-meggers" brigade prefer silence, for "men love darkness better than light when their deeds are evil." I admit that purity loses caste when it responds to the challenge of the "muck breeders"; Dr. Matthews recognizes this, but "self-preservation is the first law of nature," and the "Keg-meggers' Brigade" of muck breeders must be rooted out, in order to arrest contamination. This is a very disagreeable duty for the moralist to perform, but someone must do it, or we must perish. A noxious weed will never die by being "let alone." It must be rooted out! Never in the whole history of the "Queen City" (Seattle) was there ever displayed such a religious mockery as at this "Temple of Judas" (the tent), stamped as it is, with the infamy of "Ballington Booth, the Ahab and his Jezebel wife, Maud"; they are true types of the "House of Ahab," who, in the name of religion, operating under the diabolical influence of Jezebel, the wickedest woman that ever wore a diadem, with the assistance of the "Priests of Baal" drove that man of God, Elijah the Tishbite, into the woods to starve. But you know the story: they failed. When the "Cowboy preacher" reads this, acting the part of "Ahab," as he does, he might well exclaim in the language of the degenerate "Ahab": "Hast thou found me, O mine enemy?" or again, in the language of the "effeminate Ahab": "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" Yes, I will trouble him! He spoke to five hundred with his blasphemous tongue. I will

speaking to **twenty-five thousand** (this day) with my virtuous pen, and I will place the stigma of perfidy upon him and them, in order that the spirit of justice may view them in all their nakedness; into the pillory they go! "What's in a name?" A rose by any other name would smell as sweet, and a skunk by any other name would smell as foul. The name "Cowboy preacher" presented in a jesting manner, for "advertising purposes," is the correct description of "Sam Bettles," the "Cowboy preacher." There is "many a true word spoken in a jest." Sam Bettles bears all the ear-marks, both in language, and in appearance, of the typical frontier gambler and the "cowboy." We of Puget Sound, in early days, previous to the advent of the railroads, had him here, in all his cheap wit, cunning, and blackguardism of the Sam Bettles standard. As the "cowboy preacher" represents the refuse of the cowboys of the plains, so did his prototype of Puget Sound represent the refuse of the sailors of ships; but the sailors, in their vocation, enjoyed a great advantage over the cowboys, for they came in contact with men from all parts of the world, so when they went wrong, it was not because of ignorance, but of a desire to practice villainy for pelf. But with the "cowboy," of the "Sam Bettles type, it is different, as ignorance, presumption, brutality and blackguardism, is their normal condition. "Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise," and the "cowboy preacher" lives in blissful ignorance, supported by the most degenerate tribe in the

United States, who wear the uniform of that moral "paricide, and fratricide," Ballington Booth; who plays the role of Benedict Arnold; who betrayed his trust, and sold out both father, mother, brothers and sisters, in order that he might gratify a monstrous, selfish ambition, and serve the parvenues of New York, as he did in the beginning of his infamous career. He is now serving the degenerates of Seattle, and his mouthpiece, in the present instance, is Sam Bettes, the "cowboy preacher," whose principal following, here, is the "cuckold makers' brigade," whose infamous practices are being enhanced by a notorious "Woman Lawyeress." "We take no pleasure in seeing human nature thus degraded, and if they had not been forced upon our notice we should not have vouchsafed to them anything but a word of scorn and abhorrance, such as we continually fling at their peers—the "cuckold makers' brigade." By attempting to enshrine this effeminate offal," we have been forced to gibbet it, and from the eminence of infamy upon which we have placed it, we think they cannot easily take it down.

A Few Declarations.

Here are a few declarations made by Mr. Clayson at the "woman's suffrage debate," never before given to the world by any other writer or speaker:

No. 1—"Truth is masculine; falsehood is feminine."

No. 2—"Whenever you see a woman out on the rostrum expressing eternal truths, it is the masculine part of her that is declaring itself."

No. 3—"Whenever you see a man that is cunning, and deceitful, it is his feminine part which is expressing itself."

No. 4—"A mother who dries up the maternal fountains in order that she may "look like a maid" is a degenerate. Is she ashamed of motherhood?"

No. 5—"There is not a single thing that woman can do, but man can do better. He can even trim woman's hats and feathers, trim their dresses with ornamentations, etc., etc., more artistically than can woman."

No. 6—"Woman is a grand helmeet, but a miserable equal, for the standard of equity can be established by no other process than that of man coming down to woman's level, as she cannot rise to his."

No. 7—"Mother Dunniway, the most intellectual woman suffragist on the coast, when seeking signers from men to her petition, always took a good-looking young woman with her; she knew that men would respond quicker to the request of a young woman, with physical beauty, than they would to her own intelligence; thus, she prostituted the minds of men, and the influence would be brought to bear if 'woman suffrage' was adopted."

No. 8—"Effeminacy has ever preceded the downfall of nations, and Rome commenced to go down when woman began to rule."

No. 9—"There is no such a thing on earth as a democratic women in 'power.' Give a woman 'power' and she at once becomes aristocratic. Royalty, and aristocracy has nothing to fear, but all to gain, from 'woman suffrage.' "

No. 10—"Queen Victoria was admired all over the world as a faithful wife, and a mother, not as a Queen."

No. 11—"There is always a man—"the premier"—in charge of the Ship of State in Enland, and the Queen must submit to his dictation, as she dare not exercise her sovereign prerogatives against his will. The political influence of the Queen of England is not equal to that of the Yankee school marm."

No. 12—"No married man should take any step whatever of interest to the family, without first consulting his wife; if he does, he does not give her a chance to be his 'helpmeet'; but, if a difference of opinion arises, then who is to exercise the prerogative?"

No. 13—"With years, man gets wisdom; woman gets vanity."

No. 14—"God in His mandates declares: 'I will visit the sins of the fathers upon the children,' not the mothers', remember. The woman is not held responsible, but the 'fathers.' "

No. 15—"It is the cuckold mill which is destroying the domestic life of Seattle; not the whisky mill.

No. 16—"You, sir (to the Cowboy preacher), boast of your 'ability to box'; let me tell you

that a man may be a double-action John L. Sullivan with muscle of iron, and be able to slaughter an ox with one blow of his first, and still have an 'effeminate' mind; and on the other hand he may be a very small man, and still be possessed of all the 'masculine virtues.' "

No. 17—"Let me tell you, sir, that it takes the 'average foreignborn citizen' many years' struggle with his better nature before he gets down to the moral level of the average native-born American citizen. Until we can teach the world morals, as well as offer it lands, golds, iron, wheat, meat, fruits, etc., etc., the republic is not a success."

No. 18. As man is both the provider and protector of woman, whether in his primitive condition or in the highest order of civilization, so must he ever be her leader, or her dictator, if needs be, not only for the benefit of society generally, but for women particularly. The quills upon the fretful effeminate porcupine will quiver with rage at this honest and truthful assertion, but what does the king of the forest (the lion) care for the hostility of the porcupine? For even his roar puts the whole of his inferiors to flight, being conscious of his own superiority, he can afford to roar and let the whole inhabitants know his exact location. Cumtux?

No. 19. "As falsehood is always used as a weapon by the weaker against the stronger, so **must** women always be greater liars than men." What will the "bearded effeminate" do with this eternal truism?

No. 20. He who declares that the sexes are equal is an antagonist of the sexes; and he who antagonizes the sexes is a criminal.

No. 21. The mothers in America are the angels we should worship. Yes, indeed, they are the "strong-minded" who remain true to their marriage vows and show their womanly strength by resisting the infamous innovations of the woman's rights demagogues, the divorce shyster and the "procreative stagnator."

No. 22. When the race degenerates, man goes down, with woman in the lead. When the race regenerates, woman goes up, with man in the lead. This is the history of the world.

No. 23. "As the Greeks can tell who was the first man in their history that murdered his father or mother, so can the Romans tell who was the first man in their history who divorced his wife." Their names are held up to execration, being in the same moral category with the first murderer, Cain.

No. 24. When a man loses his audacity his virtue goes with it; when a woman loses her modesty her virtue goes with it. This marks the difference in virtue between man and woman.

No. 25. Modesty in woman is always a virtue; in man it is generally impotency.

No. 26. When a gray-headed, old, "bearded effeminate" performs the "prostrations act" to a young wench not yet in her teens, he mistakes his pusillanimity for gallantry, and she mistakes her insolence for dignity. They are both deceived. This is one of the formulas of American degeneracy.

No. 27. In love, the barbarian is the equal of the civilized man; in "duty" the civilized man is the superior of the barbarian. Love does not govern the highest standards of civilization, but duty.

No. 28. "Duty" is not found in the "Cuck-old mill," but love is there, practicing polyandry and polygamy, whilst hunting for its affinity.

No. 29—Dr. Matthews is denounced by the "woman suffrage queens of the Queen City" for his vigorous stand against their infamous presumption, but he is sustained by the three greatest moralists in America, President Roosevelt, Tom Watson and Cardinal Gibbons.

No. 30—The Prophet Isaiah says: "As is the mother so is her daughter." He did not say, as is the mother so is her son, nay, nay. The son of a noble sire can be held down to the level of a degenerate mother in his infancy, but when he becomes a man he soars away up to the moral standard of his sire, but a daughter never.

No. 31—Man's angels are all women; God's angels are all men.

No. 32—Not one woman in ten who applies for a divorce that has serious cause for it, whilst not one man in ten who applies for divorce but has the most serious cause, and yet the degenerates claims that virtue is a matter of sex, and that woman has a monopoly of it. If all "liars are to go to burning hell" the devil already has his claws upon the bearded

effeminates, and his peers, the political amazons.

No. 33—St. Paul says: "When I was a child I spake as a child, and thought as a child, but when I became a man I put away childish things." This great Apostle of Christ also says: "Be ye not effeminate."

No. 34—Jesus Christ rebuked His own mother when she merely made suggestions to Him. He exclaimed: "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" What a damn pretty set of Christians these "woman suffrage prohibitionists are.

No. 35—Character is worth more to a nation than education. Woman can teach the latter. but she cannot create or mold the former.

No. 36—A vote is nothing but a declaration. it is the force at the back of it which makes it effective. A "vote" in itself is about as useless as a "resolution" at a "woman suffrage convention."

No. 37—When Patrick Henry, at the Raleigh Tavern (a place where they sold rum), exclaimed: "Caesar had his Brutus, Charles the First had his Cromwell, and George the Third—Treason!" shouted the speaker. Treason treason was echoed round the house, while Henry, fixing his eye on the first interrupter, continued without faltering, may profit by their example, if this is treason, make the most of it." This was the action of a virtuous "masculine." He stood out "alone," as all great men ever have. What a stupid impotent ex-

pression, a thousand "effeminate votes" would have been in this connection.

No. 38—Shakespeare says, the husband is the master of the house, Webster says the husband is the head of the family. So we see that a woman who is contaminated with "woman suffrage" proclivities cannot have a "husband." She may have a creature of the male sex with fair physical proportions, but of "mental and moral femininity." Cumtux?

No. 39—I often think of the dignified position of the rostrum-hunter's husband who stays at home of an evening, washes up the tea things, then sits down all alone and studies "woman's rights" literature, and rocks an empty cradle, whilst his woman (I won't say wife. the name is too sacred) rushes out through all kinds of weather, hunting the rostrum, for the purpose of instructing depraved man upon his moral obligations. This is what the "new woman" and her degenerate peer calls progress. I call it an effeminate hell, with a bearded Jay-Bird in a cage, effeminately vanquished. Cumtux?

No. 40—"Woman's most effective weapons are falsehood and tears."

No. 41—Refinement bears no relation whatever to virtue. The very reverse is true. The world stands aghast at the standard of wickedness which has developed in America during the past forty years. the "rubber sucking bottle period." during this period masculine virtue has become dormant, and in like proportion has effeminacy become rampant.

No. 41—If refinement had anything whatever to do with virtue, then people living in cities would be more virtuous than people living in the country, but the reverse is true.

No. 42—It has been said, from time to time, that: "If a woman is fit to teach she is surely fit to vote." A stronger argument could not be used in favor of "woman suffrage." But she is unfit to teach, we believe in Rabbi Schindler, a scholarly Hebrew, who declares as follows: "When a boy goes to school, he not only goes there to learn the multiplication table, history, geography and other branches of education, but his "character" is molded there and the "spirit of effeminacy" now so prominent in America, is due to an overwhelming preponderance of women teachers in the public schools." The rabbi is right. Woman is unfit to teach.

No. 43—The very first thing a boy learns at school in America is, woman to teach, man to be instructed, woman in authority, man in subjection. So she makes him characterless at school, by the example of woman in authority, and then dominates him all through life. Ye gods, where are we at?

No. 44—The school marm, poor girl, is not to blame for this characterless progeny of hers legalized paramour from the justifiable venany more than she is answerable for being a woman. She cannot give that "desirable character" which she herself does not possess.

No. 45—It is only where nature is stronger

than education in America, that "masculine virtue" survives.

No. 46—The woman suffrage-Prohi who calls hiself a Christian is a blasphemous mocker of both the old testament and the new testament. for he makes faces at the prophets and repudiates Christ too. They are the same old hypocrites and pharisees.

No. 47—When a "bearded effeminate" trots out his peer, the political amazon to perform the "horse-whipping act" in his defense, as he does sometimes, he should be very careful who he steers her up against, for men of good sense who are "attacked by a panther" do not wait to see what sex it is before defending himself. Cumtux?

No. 48—The curses of a virtuous father are more potent than the prayers of a wicked mother. The former have ever been religiously observed in all the sanctuaries on earth, pagan and Christian alike, whilst the latter is the "holy of holies" in that effeminate institute, the "American Cuckold Mill."

No. 49—In all churches that are "effeminately vanquished," and about all the Methodist and Baptist churches in America are, hypocrisy is mistaken for morality. This is a wretched state of degeneracy, when such a large volume of people are actually unconscious of their own depravity.

No. 50—These fifty truisms, written and published for the purpose of doing good and never before given to the world in a similar man-

ner, will be received by fools with the exclamation: "**Down-on-de-wimmin,**" which is answered in the proverle of Solomon: "Though thou shouldest bray a fool in a mortar among wheat with a pestle, yet will not his foolishness depart from him."

THE WOMAN LAWYERESS.

A New Cuckold Advocate.

This new law office is opened by Leonia W. Browne and notification is sent out on engraved stationery—not only engraved, but with a monogram embossed, and the enclosed card, even, is engraved. Mrs. Browne is the fair attorney who attracted attention recently by successfully arguing a divorce case in the superior court, her first appearance before the bench. It is apparent that she has set a new mark in formal announcements.

We hope that this notorious "woman lawyeress" will get as rich and as rotten as is her vocation. We hope that her "molstrous enterprise" will bring her an immense fortune. She will then be deified as the "legal goddess of infame." Her infamous mission to Seattle was proclaimed in large type, and a very large picture of her occupied a conspicuous position in that document of corruption, **The Seattle Daily Crimes**. Her unblushing proclamation in this infamous publication declared from the housetop that she came amongst us with a "mission." Her mission is from the lowest depths of hell, prompted by the most perfidious, the most unclean, the most detestable, the most destructive of all which is most sacred in family life. **She herself has so declared!** Now let her have free

scope! Let us be as honest in our degradation as she is in her proclamation. She declared that she came amongst us in the interest of "legalized cuckoldry," and the result of her "published proclamation" was that the "cuckold applicants" on the official "roll of infamy," at the Temple of Infame on Profanity Hill, Seattle, increased 400 per cent in one week. Ye gods, what a triumph for "legalized whoredom!" The dignified position of this petticoat solicitor is that of an official baud "above the deadline." The United States commission declared that Seattle was the rottenest pesthole of cuckoldry in America, before this afficial baud came amongst us, with the purpose of making a fortune out of our rottenness. May she succeed! Her success would be a test of our virtues. Let us push our "criminal rights" to the full limit of the law. And how befitting it is, too, that this unholy retrogression should be led by a woman in this "The Terminal City of the World!" The public press of this city has been used for the purpose of advertising the effeminate luxuries with which this cuckold maker's nest is adorned. This "affinity dive" is dignified by the title of "Law Office" in the New York Block. This is a free ad. Whenever we advertise the "cuckold maker's trade" we charge nothing for it. Such "foul fiends" might be acceptable to "Benny Benedict's" Methodist Church at Green Lake, among the Prohibitionists, but the toughest saloon in town would refuse such "foul fiends." Any

woman in Seattle between the ages of 18 and 60 can have eighty-three legal husbands. Now since the advent in our midst of this fictional "functioness" of the law, those legalized jades who assume an air of respectability and moral superiority over their sisters in the "restricted district" will be encouraged in the **unrestricted district** to push their legal rights to the full limit, encouraged and protected by their guardian angel. "Lioness Browne," the lawyeress of infame.

NEW THOUGHTS! WHO DO THEY BELONG TO?

No one can give what he has not.—Latin.

Very true, and he has no right to hold that which he has, unless he himself created it. No man ever created a thought! This is something new to you thoughtless thinkers, is it not? Did you ever hear such a declaration before, except in the columns of this paper? Thoughts come from where? No one knows. They are both holy and unholy; pure and unpure; useful and useless; elevating and degrading. There is a tribe of thoughtless aspirants who call themselves "Free Thoughtest," who publish tons of rotten literature, and they think they are progressive monitors—the fools! Thoughts are free in spite of any individual mind, in which they first appear, to control them; thoughts come and go in spite of a temporary possessor. Where do they go? No one knows; whence they came, no one knows. Someone has said that "he who lets a valuable thought escape him is a criminal." There is much in this, and I will add

that he who cherishes and promulgates a "bad thought" is a worse criminal than he who lets a good thought escape. Thus we see the responsibility of the individual who can control his will, his actions, but not his thoughts. Those fools who spend so much money and time upon what they erroneously call "Free Thought," would be in a more intelligent and truthful position if they called themselves "Free Actionists" or "Free Speakers," instead of "Free Thoughtists." These erroneous workers mistake action or gab for thought. When a man sits down and thinks he is merely trying to remember something he has forgot, or he is trying to develop to its fullness the thought which already exists in his mind—probably the recorded thought of others—thus he is a "valuable worker," and if he succeeds in developing something of value to society we give him a copyright, or a patent for his "labor," not for his "thought." Education is very useful to the thoughtful man with a strong mind, one who can "bear the burden of thought," but to force upon weak minds or even commonplace minds great intellectual burdens is as criminal as it is stupidly ambitious, for it invariably proves disastrous to the victim, as it incapacitates him for commonplace positions in life where he would be both useful to himself, and a valuable member to the commonweal at the same time. Education, as a whole, is merely the "recorded thoughts" of the most valuable minds, which cannot be over estimated, but the whole volume of education never "created a thought." Cumtux?

The power of the press was never more forcibly illustrated than that of the Hearst papers in the recent exposures of Foraker and Haskel. If Mr. Hearst had no papers, or if he had but **one** paper, we might say, which reached possibly one hundred thousand readers, then the "exposures" which have been ventilated within the past few days would have been **silenced down** by the great papers; their "extensive patronage" which they enjoy from the "powerful frauds which Hearst exposed would have silenced them without a doubt, but Mr. Hearst having so many papers reaching "millions of readers," he **forced** the other great papers to publish the news given out by Mr. Hearst from the public platform. If they had not done this they would have been as ridiculous as W. J. Bryan was two weeks ago when he declared that he had "no time to defend honesty," but Hearst forced him to come to time and defend (as far as he could) rascality. Does anyone of common sense think for a moment that Mr. Hearst could not have **sold his silence at ANY PRICE** he choosed to name? Most assuredly he could, and he being strong enough to resist such a great material temptation places him in a pre-eminent position as a "great publisher," and this moral bravery should bring him a great many supporters in the political field which he has entered.

Rooseveltianism! Watsonism! Hearstism are the "triune" which must be adopted, if this Republic is to go, onward, and upward, and **Bryanism**, with its woman suffrage and other

political garbage, must be eliminated; whilst Debsism will continue on and on, finding a political home for the "idealist" whose imagination grasps at the "beautiful hues of the political rainbow" that are charming vaporous shadows which the "socialist" mistakes for substance. But they are there, right in sight—a misty truth.

"The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God." There is so much gab, and fierce gnashing of heathenish teeth at the present time about God, in many of those small magazines which come to hand, that we are prompted to say a word about this interesting subject. Great students of eminent standing who have studied the ancient languages thoroughly, tell us that the name "God" in very ancient times was "Good," and that it gradually reached its present name (God) and the holy significance by which it is now recognized. If this is true, and there seems to be no doubt about it, then I proclaim from the housetop that I have much greater faith in the "goodness" of the human family than ever, for what more commendable thing could the human mind conceive than to deify "Good" by calling it God?" **"The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God."** This quotation is from the wisest man that ever lived. Solomon, who praised the "great virtues of wine." He was no hypocrite, nor a prohibitionist. Hence he rebukes the man and calls him **a fool who says in his heart there is no "Good."**

It takes a man who loves life, and the "good" things of this life to declare a man to be a fool who says in his heart there is no "good." Solomon was, no doubt, after the prohibitionists of his day who loved neither woman, wine nor song. We have read in the scriptures somewhere which says: "God is a spirit;" the "good" spirit, of course. We read also that "God spake unto Moses." What more holy than this: "Good" spoke unto Moses;" the "good spirit," of course. What better or more reasonable construction can we apply than this, or what more intelligent conclusion can we reach than this? Those "students of ancient languages" have given us the "key" which seems to fit the door of inquiry and investigation upon the word God (Good). We read in the scriptures of a "merciful God," and a "revengeful God." Is there anything conflicting about this? Is not "goodness" merciful, and is not "goodness" revengeful? A man who is destitute of the spirit of revenge against injustice, tyranny, lying, deceit and all kinds of wickedness, has no God (good) in him. The spirit of God (good) spoke unto Moses, and Abraham, and all the prophets, and it speaks to-day as ever. It spoke to Shakespeare, Burnes, Moore; it spoke to Washington, Jefferson, Patrick Henry; it spoke to Lincoln, Webster, Clay; it speaks today to Tolstoi, Roosevelt, Watson, but not to Bryan, for the spirit of God (good) is not in a deceitful, characterless man, and a "worshipper of the golden calf."

The saloonkeeper who denounces all churches is a big fool, and the preacher who denounces all saloonkeepers is a still bigger fool. All that is best in the whole civilized world came from both places. Individual opinion stands for nothing as compared to the recorded evidence of all history. The preacher and the publican are the two important characters of all others in all civilized life. In some small country towns, in some of the most moral communities, in Europe, where there is no magistrate, the publican fills that office, not the preacher; and I may remark still farther that a very large volume of all that is brightest, best, the most entertaining and intellectual came from the public houses. The "coffee houses," as they are called in many of the largest cities of Europe, the cafes and saloons of America today fill the same place. Take Webster's Unabridged Dictionary; in that vast volume of recorded wit and intelligence, what name will you find more frequently quoted than that of Johnson, the great English philosopher and wit? Page after page you will find "Boswells Johnson" repeated again and again, full of moral philosophy and wit. Boswell, although an educated man and a lawyer, was not a "man of parts" himself, but he had a keen appreciation of those who were his superiors in this respect; so he spent all his spare moments, whenever opportunity afforded it, at the "coffee house" in the company of Johnson over the wine cup, and this shrewd observer recorded everything which Johnson said. He knew that they had a commercial value as

well as a great literary significance, so when Johnson died out came Boswell's Johnson," being a book of great literary value which astonished and instructed the whole literary world, and the valuable matter which "Boswell's Johnson" contains would have been forever lost to the world only for the convenience of the cafe and the inspiration of the wine cup. Cumtux?

A FEARFUL INDICTMENT OF AMERICA **By President Avery of the Washington State** **Bar Association.**

We regret our inability to present the whole of President Avery's address upon such a vital subject as it appeared in the P.-I. of August 25th, 1908. We have made a few selections, however, and present them herewith. Our old readers will recognize in this wholesome and severe rebuke of President Avery the genral tenor of scores of articles in "The Patriarch" during our seven and a half years publication. It is gratifying (though shameful) to find our own "published indictments" endorsed from such a distinguished source as this of the president of the Washington State Bar Association, who evidently is a brave, intellectual, scholarly American of the "old school," determined to give his services for the benefit of the people. But, sad to say, it is one of those "burdensome duties" which none but the "greatest of moralists will assume, and they must be content with "virtue being its own reward," as no appropriate emoluments are associated with such services, for they are above a price. We would

recommend the whole of our readers to send for the "Seattle Post-Intelligencer" of the date above stated, and read the whole lesson. It will make thoughtful people think. It is no use to appeal to thoughtless people who study nothing but "business villiany," as they do not comprehend that it is the moralist who moves the world, not the materialist, and these materialistic dunces are utterly ignorant of what constitutes a moralist. The shouts of a blatherskite in a "gospel tent," the yell of a "prohibition hypocrite" in the pulpit, and a demagogue in politics doing the same thing is their standard ideal of morals. Their uniform keg-meg, and their effeminate clap-trap stand in marked contrast to the strenuous thoughts so ably presented by that dignified moral teacher, President Avery of the Washington State Bar Association. To think that such a "vital lesson" should be received "in silence" is extremely discouraging. If our moral condition was not at a very low ebb, the editorial columns of all the papers would be ablaze with this subject, and the pulpits would echo it from one end of the coast to the other. But what are editors and preachers doing? They are blasted with hypocrisy and demagoguism, shouting "Prohibition! Prohibition!" and this spirit of tyranny they (the majority of them) mistake for morality, and those few who know better are shouting this subterfuge for morals in order to cover up their own guilt, whilst the "indictment" of President Avery is received in silence. But "si-

lence gives consent." **It is a true bill of indictment!** Here are a few selections from it:

"No more enlightened people exist than those of this country. That fact is evidenced by our marvelous growth and advancement in everything that goes to make a great and prosperous nation, except its respect for the law. To what extent we are thus wanting as compared with other countries I shall presently attempt to demonstrate, and I regret more than I can here express that we are, as a nation, more deficient in this respect than any other in the civilized world.

"I am not a pessimist. I believe in this country and in its ability to lead the world in everything that goes to make it more enlightened and better, yet it is not only futile, but harmful, to close our eyes to some conditions that exist and which must be remedied. It is because we have so long ignored these conditions that they now menace our national life.

* * * * *

"A man had been convicted of a crime by the superior court, a new trial had been refused, and the supreme court on appeal had affirmed the verdict and judgment of the lower court. While the prisoner was still out on bail, a petition was circulated, asking for his pardon. It was signed very generally and, I believe, by some of the state's officers who brought about the conviction, many of the jurors, and hosts of friends of the prisoner, and was accompanied by a letter from the presiding judge, to the effect that the prisoner had not, in his opinion, had a fair trial.

* * * * *

"Of course, this disrespect can only make breaches of the law more common. Fear as well as respect is reduced to a minimum. The unscrupulous man has little to lose and much to gain by illegal and dishonest methods and the result is that dishonesty is at this time rampant in this glorious country of ours. Boys, girls, men and women, by reason of the lessons of disrespect for the law which we daily teach, are encouraged to commit crime.

"One of the large business enterprises of the city of Spokane found it necessary to employ a collector to collect the monthly accounts **against its patrons.**

Four boys were hired in succession and each was discharged because he stole from his collections, and the manager informed me that it was almost impossible to secure honest help of this kind. Was not that shocking? But the illustration is not ended. I was so impressed with the manager's statement that I told it to an acquaintance who responded by saying, 'What would you expect from boys who receive small wages.'

Try to Justify Thefts.

"Do you realize the sentiment which that man expressed was that if an employer did not give sufficient wages the employe was justified in stealing from him? Yet the man stood well in the community in which he lived. I don't know whether the boys in question received adequate pay or not—that is immaterial, but I do know that the number of people who entertain and express opinions like the one just quoted are so great that their pernicious influence is rapidly undermining our national life.

"To deal less generally and more specifically with this great menace, let me suggest a few startling facts respecting homicides in this country. While this is but one character of disrespect for the law, it is the most serious and is, perhaps, more susceptible of comparative treatment than any other. There are at this time nearly five times as many homicides in this country to each million of people, as in the year 1881. In other words, while we wrongfully took the life of one human being in 1881, we now take the lives of five, and I am allowing due credit for the increase in population. Does not that suggest some reason for alarm?

"Are we five times as bloodthirsty in 1908 as we were in 1881, or have we now but one-fifth of the respect for the law that we had then? But you ask, what about other countries? Their lawlessness is material only to ascertain whether ours is exceptional. An inspection of their record, however, only emphasizes our condition.

America Leads in Homicides.

"Dear old New England, from whence we have a right to expect the best of everything, in proportion to population, has twelve times as many homicides as the city of London; in California, they are sev-

enty-five times as numerous as in London, and Nevada kills 245 persons every time London kills one. From another view, New England has nearly a million less inhabitants than London and has 254 homicides, while London has 24. California, with less than one-fourth of London's population, has 422 homicides as against twenty-four in London.

"During a recent twelve months there were 118 homicides in Chicago (besides a large number of deadly assaults). In Paris, during the same period, only fifteen murders occurred, and in London there were twenty. In other words, while wicked Paris was murdering one human being, Chicago was murdering eight.

* * * * *

"It seems as though these figures should be applied to a penal colony instead of the 'land of the free and the home of the brave.' We ask why does this appalling increase in crime go on beyond all comparison with other countries, and it will be answered in many ways. There are probably grave faults in our criminal procedure, but the real root of the evil is our failure as a people to yield to the law the veneration to which it is entitled. If those with naturally good tendencies fail to look upon the law with the respect which is due it, what can we expect of those with evil tendencies, who obey it, if at all, not with conscientious regard, but through fear and fear alone? What we need is more obedience to the law because it is the law.

* * * * *

Material Success Blinds People.

"Why is it that we are so indifferent? It can only be because we have been, as a nation, so successful and so prosperous that our material success has caused us to forget or disregard matters that are really of far greater importance. We create booster clubs, chambers of commerce and other bodies to exploit the freedom of our respective communities from disease, but the fact that this country leads in criminality many times over every country in Europe, barely creates a comment, and that crime in the United States is increasing at an appalling rate is acknowledged with almost brutal indifference. The editor of one of our law magazines recently said:

“ ‘Only a penal colony to which all the rest of the world has transported its worst criminals could show such an appalling list of crimes as are committed in this enlightened nation, which has been looked upon in some respects at least as a leader in civilization. In the multitude of other questions that absorb the public attention, comparatively little is said or thought about the fact that the nation, standing well-nigh, if not quite, at the head of all nations in the world in most of the elements of civilization, stands far below the worst of them in its horrible record of crime.’

“It is easy and popular to charge the courts, and the procedure connected therewith, with the responsibility for this condition, and they are not without defects, but I firmly believe that the evil has a deeper root and that the fault lies primarily with the people themselves. If our so-called good citizens fail to treat the law with reverence, or at least with respect what can be expected of those whose sole interest they believe lies in defying it?

“Even in the administration of our criminal law, the people, so-called, have quite as much responsibility as the court. If they as citizens and jurors give to the law that loyalty which they exact of the courts, considered independent of jurors, they will aid greatly in stilling the cry against the miscarriage of justice.

* * * * *

“Notwithstanding our growing disrespect for the law, there seems to be a perfect mania for making laws, a goodly portion of which are for the purpose of subserving some private end, or trying to control the actions of individuals in matters that would be controlled and regulated by common sense or common decency.

“What would the framers of our national constitution have thought had they been told that because of the privileges therein granted to the different states, such states would attempt with more or less success to pass laws prohibiting kissing in public, flirting in the park, or making it a ground for divorce for the wife to have concealed from her prospective husband during their courtship the fact that she wore false hair or used cosmetics? Those are but sam-

ples of the freak legislation that is attempted or perpetrated at every session of the different legislatures, to say nothing of the ordinances of a similar character that are made the law in smaller municipalities. Such legislation is not only not helpful, but positively harmful, and it is hard to believe that there are enough persons legally qualified to enact such laws, who would be guilty of it.

"It is this character of legislation that fosters our disrespect for the law generally; the ridicule and contempt that naturally goes with such legislation is bound to reach enactments of a wholesome and useful character which have for their object the good of the people as a whole. We are overgoverned, and one of the gravest effects is its influence on our conception of the dignity of the law and our consequent lack of respect therefor.

* * * * *

"What is desired is to ascertain the reason for these tendencies, and then to the best of our ability remedy them.

"I trust that the result which I have stated as flowing from our disrespect for the law may not be considered at the expense of the cause, for that is precisely what I desire to guard against. We can, I believe, overcome the cause; the effects will then more nearly take care of themselves. I do not believe that people can be made good by mere legislation. Something more is necessary.

* * * * *

"In speaking on this subject, I do not flatter myself that I have said anything that you do not already know, but I cannot believe that it is by all fully appreciated, and if by these remarks I may be able, in any degree, to create an interest, I shall feel gratified.

"I have dared to make these comments, feeling that even if they were not made in a style that would challenge your attention, they would, perhaps, shock some person or body into some activity in respect to this subject that would directly or indirectly accomplish some good. I am aware that the subject is not a new one, and that others have raised a warning cry, but that does not prompt me to apologize for repeating it—it must be repeated and literally ham-

mered through our armor of indifference or the penalty will be of a nature that I do not like to contemplate."

President Avery, although a moralist of no commonplace standing, and his moral nature is evidently stirred to its utmost depths, talks more like a lawyer than a "moral philosopher"; he emphasizes the crime of a "disregard for law," and he is right; but for a scholarly gentleman of his attainments he did not touch the fundamental condition which is the root of the evil. Go into our public schools today, and of the millions of scholars of both sexes between the ages of 6 and 16 you will not find two per cent. of them who can repeat the Ten Commandments." There is not eight per cent. who can repeat three of them, and the other ninety per cent. know nothing about them at all, nor do they want to know. They do not know whether they originated with Moses, Christ, George Washington or President Roosevelt. Their minds are stimulated and their morals are a blank. So they reach maturity utterly destitute of moral training; in fact, the teachers are forbidden by law to give them religious instruction; so moral degeneracy is promoted under these shameful conditions, the multiplication table becomes a "sacred ideal" and the "Decalogue" is looked upon as a satire upon intelligence. Under these dreadful conditions intellectual pursuits become abnormal, and this abnormality becomes sacred whether the intellectual triumph is moral or immoral. There are some four hundred lawyers' offices in Seattle, and it is pretty safe to

say that there is not a Bible in ten of them, although "Blackstone" says that "a lawyer cannot practice law thoroughly without studying the Bible; so this condition in the law offices of Seattle is presumptive evidence, not so very speculative either, that they are merely "lglal dens," making a living out of legalized rascality, made legal by rascally or ignorant legislators. "Honor thy father and thy mother." How many children in Seattle know or care anything about this? Children in Seattle love their parents as well as they do in any other city without a doubt, but they do not "revere" them. "Reverence" they know nothing about. Children of savages love their parents, too, but they know nothing about "honoring" them. The only "reverence" of a savage is for the "bow and arrow" or the "fish spear," and the Indian who can use them the most dexterously; so he is a good materialistic American. "Delate hi-hu. Cumtux?" Hypocrisy and criminality are American jokemates. They are keeping pace with each other. Hypocrisy is upon the topmost round of the ladder, and it is shouting to the world "Prohibition! Prohibition!!" whilst 525,000 victims, annually, are brought under the wheels of the "juggernaut" of **sober, industrious depravity**, conducted by the "Don't Cares," who are indifferent to both death and damnation. Hypocrisy breeds criminals, and one crime begets another, but "the hypocrite's hope shall perish" amidst the gnashing of prohibition teeth, being a degenerate, irresponsible mob that they are, who

are "drunken but not with wine." * * *

In order to demonstrate our great appreciation of "purity" we fine the unfortunate women in the "restricted" district ten dollars a month and put them under the strict surveillance of the police, whilst "loose married jades" seek the "unrestricted district," and are encouraged by law to rob, plunder and "cuckold" their husbands, receiving an "official diploma" from the "official cuckold" maker on Profanity Hill for this purpose. This is her lawful permit to practice prostitution respectably. This "infamous permit" enables her to become a shining light in the society columns, where she can (being respectable) join in the general chorus concerning that shameful (?) lot of creatures below the deadline). We ask in all sincerity which baud of the two is doing the greatest damage to society; is it the prominent "Emma Norton" of the "restricted district," or is it Lenora Lioness Brown of the "unrestricted district"? Probably Benny Benedict, the Methodist preacher of Green Lake, can give us the desired information.

JAP MORALITY.

Americans are the most inconsistent (or in other words, the most dishonest) people on earth. We have reached that standard of degradation that we will put up with any indignity or humiliation, either locally, nationally or internationally, provided there is "anything in it." America used to fight for "honor"; they

now fight for the stuff. Our grasping commercial desires enslave us. We have the greatest material opportunities of any people on earth. We are so infernally "smart" and villainous with each other at home that this standard of business villainy has become our normal condition, and it manifests itself abroad, sometimes, so this conduct often places a stigma upon Americans who are not deserving of it, through the actions of some smart traders.

Until we frown down "smartness," instead of showing our approval of it, we shall not attain to a standard of uprightness which should make an American abroad feel proud of his countrymen. Our exchanges for the past couple of weeks are full of denunciation of the "Japs."

We have taught the Japs this: "To the victors belong the spoils." And now we are denouncing them for demanding the "spoils" which are theirs through the fortunes of war. The "mob" in Japan burned all the Christian churches they could reach, and assassinated the family of their representative at the "peace conference." The "mob" is always truthful, but the "mob" is not always right, but its expression is as reliable as the lightning which precedes the clap of thunder. A very large majority of our editors are faulty; they set a far higher standard upon popularity than they do of truthfulness and uprightness. The memories of a majority of editors do not seem to

last them over night, not even in the most momentous affairs. A Japanese scholar passed through Seattle a few months ago, and in an interview said: "We are teaching our children in the schools of Japan upon the 'American plan' as much as possible, but our higher standards of education are **Chinese Classics.**" This shows that they prefer **Chinese ethics** to ours. Thus we see the spirit that "burned and destroyed Christian churches." The Japanese, like the Chinese, are learning all about our business methods, and our system of conducting war, and of manufacturing weapons and missiles of war. In this they have shown much ingenuity and cunning, but as they repudiate our standard of "ethics," all the rest of our methods of a material nature they have adopted is from policy, and not from principle. Practical Confucianism is a superior moral condition to that of Christian hypocrisy.—Patriarch, Sept. 23, 1905.

PROHIBITION AND LOCAL OPTION.

By William H. Taft.

"Nothing is more foolish, nothing more utterly at variance with sound public policy than to enact a law which, by reason of the conditions surrounding the community in which it is declared to be law, is incapable of enforcement. Such an instance is sometimes presented by sumptuary laws, by which the sale of intoxicating liquors is prohibited under penalty, in localities where the public sentiment of the immediate community does not and will not sustain the enforcement of the law. In such cases the legislation is usually the result of agitation by people in the country who are determined to make

their fellow citizens in the city better. The enactment of the law comes through the country representatives, who form a majority of the legislature; but the enforcement of the law is among the people who are generally opposed to its enactment, and under such circumstances the law is a dead letter. This result is the great argument in favor of so-called local option, which is really an instrumentality for determining whether a law can be enforced before it is made operative. In cases where the sale of liquor cannot be prohibited in fact, it is far better to regulate and diminish the evil than to attempt to stamp it out. By the enactment of a drastic law and the failure to enforce it, there is injected into the public mind the idea that laws are to be observed or violated according to the will of those observed or violated according to the will of those affected. I need not say how altogether pernicious such a loose theory is. General Grant said that the way to secure the repeal of a bad law was to enforce it. But when the part of the community which enacts the law is not the part affected by its enforcement, this is not a practical method. The constant violation or neglect of any law leads to a demoralized view of all laws, and the choice of the laws to be enforced then becomes as uncertain as the guess of a political executive in respect to public opinion is likely to make it. Such a policy constantly enlarges in the community the class of men with whom the sacredness of the law does not exist."—From "FOUR ASPECTS OF CIVIC DUTY" (Pages 46, 47, 48) by WILLIAM H. TAFT.

SLAUGHTER BY THE DON'T CARES.

Our customary slaughter for the past two weeks on the railroads and other places, has been unusually large. It will take at least the passing away of this generation in America of "Don't Cares" and the breeding of a generation of "Do Cares" before this "reckless murder" will cease. You cannot have careful men

without **disciplined boys**, and you cannot have **disciplined boys** with women in charge of the public schools. This is the fundamental source of the "Don't Cares," and we are paying a fearful price for maintaining the irresponsible instead of the responsible in the public schools. The sooner that "women" are dismissed from this responsible position, and men are put in their places, the sooner will you have **disciplined boys**, which signifies "Do Care" men. Please observe the pusillanemous spectacle of the native born American toward all women, between the ages of 10 and 50 years. (Men over 50 years of age do not do this. He knows better.) He performs the "prostration act" towards all petticoats, old and young alike; moral and immoral alike, cultured or illiterate alike. He is a "schooled" degenerate, but he is not to blame for his degeneracy. He has been trained to acknowledge women as his instructor and his superior. This is why his "masculine character" is dormant and "effeminate pusillanimity" is active in him, and he cherishes "cunning and effeminacy" as an ideal instead of masculine virtue. To perform a **duty** under men is irksome to him. Now, please observe his conduct towards **all men**, both young and old, moral or immoral, cultivated or uncultivated alike. He is both insolent and brutal towards all men, and is unfitted to occupy positions of trust, where honesty, truthfulness, uprightness, **discipline** and **respect** towards men in office are very essential. D-U-T-Y he knows nothing about, and he cares less. He, in his con-

ceit, has a right to exercise, not a duty to perform. He is a cunning, effeminate, brutal degenerate. He is a "Don't Care," and it is from this undisciplined malformation that we are confronted with and are receiving such a desperate "murderous chastisement as a nation." Here are the figures of our brutal enormity, the result of our murderous "Don't Cares" for "railroad accidents" alone for the current year officially reported by "The Interstate Commerce Commission." They show 11,839 killed and 111,016 injured. And as Mr. Julius Kruttschnitt, one of the greatest railroad managers in the United States, so wisely says: "It should be the duty of railroad managers to give these figures greater publicity than to minimize or conceal them." This worthy declaration from a man of such prominence in railroad circles shows a depreciation of "cunning" and a desire for a "Square Deal." He is evidently a "Rooseveltian." But the Keg-meggers' brigade, consisting of woman suffragists, woman teachers, woman lawyers, woman doctors, woman cuckold makers (legal ones), woman preachers, woman politicians; woe, woe, woe, with their fictional funk "ad infinitum," supported by their victims, the "bearded effeminate," seem to forget that the "woman's century" (the nineteenth) has closed, and that they are merely the fag end, the dying embers of that Effeminate Century, struggling to maintain their rottenness against the disastrous experiences which their prestige has brought upon us, and the "Rooseveltians" of today have

declared it "shall cease." I use the term "Rooseveltian" advisedly, as it comprises neither age, sex, religion or political party, but it represents a return of "masculine virtue" stimulated as it is by the example of that remarkable man, Theodore Roosevelt. You all know the story of "little drops of water, little grains of sand," etc., etc. Well, **The Patriarch** has been scattered both far and near during the past seven and a half years, and has continually preached the doctrine of "man's duties and man's prerogatives," and our "little drops of water and little grains of sand" have not been a barren waste, for I notice with pleasure that the true philosophy which I have continued to preach, against this "effeminate retrogression," is now manifesting itself in many directions amongst the most worthy people, who ten years ago were silent, except at very long intervals. Here is a card mailed to me from Chicago:

SAFETY ON RAILROADS.

When the people cease to put a premium on inefficiency of labor as they have been doing of late years, when honesty of service is regarded as essential as honesty in finance, when the man or boy who steals his employer's time is regarded in the same way as the one who steals his employer's dollars, * * * when the people are willing to pay freight and passenger rates sufficient to enable the roads to build better roadbeds and more double track and have better rolling stock, when the silly talk about watered stock is ended and people realize that English roads are capitalized at an average of nearly four times the average in this country, and that the average of English freight rates is nearly four times our average, then we may begin to see better and safer railroads and fewer accidents involving fright-

ful loss of life. Just now the American people seem to prefer cheap roads, cheap rates, and cheap human life to higher rates and a greater safety to life and limb.—The Manufacturers' Record, Baltimore, July 30th, 1908.

The above card from **The Manufacturers' Record of Baltimore**, presents very valuable suggestions, but it does not know or else it is "afraid to tell the truth." It is an awful truth which we present, but our "dreadful experiences" force us to face the music, as "truth will out." We have sown the wind, and we are reaping the whirlwind." "What shall we do to be saved?" This is the vital question! If our "killing, maiming, murdering wickedness," and "don't-care-a-damism" was confined "principally to the railroads," then the above matter might cover the ground and "safety" would soon be secured, but my dear **Manufacturers' Record**, the wicked enormity with which we, as a people, are confronted, is in all our industrial pursuits, the railroads representing only one-fifth of the whole. The Rev. Josiah Strong, chairman of the National Committee, appointed by congress two years ago to enquire into our "murderous career," in his official report says that the sum total of our "killed and wounded" annually is 525,000. Was there ever such a frightful slaughter as this in peaceful vocations in the whole world's history? Five hundred and twenty-five thousand were the figures two years ago. This enormous number has increased considerably in the past two years.

FOLLY OF PROHIBITION.

What Eminent Men Say—Views of Ministers and the Press.

Thomas Jefferson.

"Our legislators are not sufficiently apprised of the rightful limits of their power; that their true office is to declare and enforce only our natural rights and duties, and take none of them from us. No man has a natural right to commit aggression on the equal rights of another; and this is all from which the law ought to restrain him; every man is under the natural duty of contributing to the necessities of society, and this is all the laws ought to enforce on him; and no man having a natural right to be the judge between himself and another, it is his natural duty to submit to the umpirage of an impartial third. When the laws have declared and enforced all this, they have fulfilled their functions, and the idea is quite unfounded that on entering into society we give up any natural right."

Abraham Lincoln.

"Prohibition will work great injury to the cause of temperance. It is a species of intemperance within itself, for it goes beyond the bounds of reason in that it attempts to control a man's appetite by legislation, and in making crimes out of things that are not crimes. A prohibition law strikes a blow at the very principles on which our government was founded. I have always been found laboring to protect the weaker classes from the stronger, and I never can give my consent to such a law as you propose to enact. Until my tongue shall be silenced in death, I will continue to fight for the rights of men."

Horatio Seymour.

"I owe it to the subject and to the friends of the measure to add the expression of my belief, that intemperance cannot be extirpated by prohibitory laws; they are not consistent with sound principles of legislation. Like decrees to regulate religious creeds, or forms of worship, they provoke resistance where they are designed to force obedience. The effort to suppress intemperance by unusual and arbitrary measures proves that the legislature is attempting to do that which is not within its province to enact or its

power to enforce. All experience shows that temperance, like other virtues, is not produced by law-makers, but by the influence of education, morality and religion."

General U. S. Grant.

"I know from my own experience that when I was at West Point the fact that tobacco in every form was prohibited, and the mere possession of the weed severely punished, made a majority of the cadets, myself included, try to acquire the habit of using it."

Samuel J. Tilden.

"It is no part of the duty of the state to coerce the individual man, except so far as his conduct may effect others; not remotely and consequentially, but by violating rights which legislation can recognize and undertake to protect. The opposite principle leaves no room for individual reason and conscience, trusts nothing to self-culture, and substitutes the wisdom of the senate and assembly for the plan of moral government ordained by Providence. The whole progress of society consists in learning how to attain by the independent action or voluntary association of individuals those objects which are at first attempted only through the agency of government and in lessening the sphere of legislation and enlarging that of the individual reason and conscience."

John Quincy Adams.

"Forget not, I pray you, the right of personal freedom. Self-government is the foundation of all our political and social institutions, and it is by self-government alone that the law of temperance can be enforced. Seek not to enforce upon your brother by legislative enactments that virtue which he can possess only by the dictates of his own conscience and the energy of his own free will."

Oliver Wendell Holmes and 126 Doctors.

"We, the undersigned, physicians of Massachusetts, while advocating temperance among our people, and all appropriate measures to promote it, believe that the adoption of the proposed amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquor would not accomplish its intended purpose, but would

lead to the surreptitious sale of inferior wines and liquors."

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES,
HENRY J. BIGELOW,
And 125 Others.

Gail Hamilton,

Speaking of Prohibition in Maine, says in the North American Review:

"The actual result is that liquor is sold to all who wish to obtain it in nearly every town in the state. Enforcement of the prohibition law seems to have but little effect. For the last six years the city of Bangor has practically had free rum. In more than one hundred places liquor is sold, and no attempt is made to enforce the law. In Bath, Lewiston, Augusta and other cities no real difficulty is experienced in procuring liquors. In Portland enforcement of the law has been faithfully attempted, yet the liquor traffic flourishes for all classes from the highest to the lowest."

MINISTERS ON PROHIBITION.

Rev. Dr. Leonard Bacon.

"In the long run the operation, or the inoperativeness of this law" (Main prohibitory law) "is as mischievous as its pretensions are dishonest, its arguments fallacious and its title fraudulent. The doom of failure is written in every structure of it, contrived, as it is, to work with the utmost friction and annoyance, with perversions abhorrent to all traditions of freedom, for secret information and domiciliary visitation, and search."

Rev. Lyman Abbott.

"This" (prohibition) "was not the method of Jesus. He lived in an age of total abstinence societies and did not join them. He emphasized the distinction between His method and that of John the Baptist, by saying that John came neither eating nor drinking; the Son of Man came eating and drinking. He condemned drunkenness, but never in a single instance lifted up His voice in condemnation of drinking. On the contrary, He commenced His public ministry by making, as a miracle, wine in considerable quantity, and of fine quality, and this apparently only to add to the joyous festivities of a wedding. He apparently used wine customarily, if not habitually, and before all the world; and He left as a legacy

and example for His followers a sacred use of wine in the most solemn service of His church."

Rev. Samuel R. Wilson.

"Its" (the Prohibition party) "fanatical disregard and distortion of facts is shown in the constant assertion that the liquor trade is the cause of almost all the crimes that are committed, and of all the worst crimes, and if this trade could be prohibited by law, the jails and penitentiaries and almshouses would no longer be needed; vice or crime would cease to pollute the land, and the day of peace, love and plenty forever gild the joyous earth. Could any fancy be more wild?"

Rev. Dr. Frierson.

To the question, "Have ministers of the Gospel and their churches any right to advocate prohibition?" the Rev. Dr. D. F. Frierson says, in the Christian Observer. "When he (the minister) preaches prohibition he forsakes his legitimate weapons and ruins his own cause. He destroys that perfectly free option to which he must make his appeal. He puts himself and his ministry in the absurd position of appealing to the moral nature at the moment that he is advocating compulsion. Why should he persuade at all if he can get a law to compel?"

Cardinal Gibbons.

These are in the Patriarch frame for October, 1900, also the bottom selection from "Cardinal Gibbons."

"I have never been able to convince myself that what we call total abstinence is essential to morality. The moderate and occasional use of alcoholic liquors is not to be condemned. In countries like France and Italy, where the people as a rule drink wine, no serious harm results from the practice. Even in Rome—even at the Vatican—wine is not prohibited, and, as we know, the papal doctors themselves prescribe it for His Holiness.

"Then, again, I long since came to understand that, putting aside the point of principle, it was virtually impossible to enforce a total abstinence law in a large community or in a state. Look at Maine, as an instance, and you will see how true this is. The attempt to enforce such a law must consequently lead to one of the worst things—illegality or hypocrisy; possibly to both."

Ex-Governor Andrew of Massachusetts.

"Artificial offences and meddlesome legislation, and that felt to be unjust, are, indeed, causes of crime, of which the philosophical educator cannot afford to be ignorant. Artificial offences put a large class of people, and often that of the least discriminating and instructed, into needless antagonism with the law. Confounding the moral distinctions on the side of the law begets a corresponding confusion in the mind of the citizen. If the law treats the sale of a mug of beer or sweet cider as of like delinquency with the crime of larceny, how long will it take the humble and unlearned to conclude that the law is either a sham unworthy of veneration, or else jump to the converse of the first proposition, and vote larceny of an article to be no worse than the selling of the beer or the cider? So, therefore, every statute denouncing the penalties of the criminal law against men in violation of the commonly received sense of justice concerning human relations in the civil state, becomes, by reason of that very excess, a generation of evil. The laws under which men are punishable can have no moral value unless the appeal can also be made to the conscience of men."

Thomas F. Bayard.

"So far as my experience goes, a well-regulated system of license whereby revenue is largely brought into the public treasury, coupled with severe penalties for illicit sales, has provided the most efficient check upon the abuse of the liquor traffic. In many respects the question is a sumptuary one, the laws attempting to establish sumptuary regulations become inquisitorial and impossible of execution, so that in those communities of this country where they have been enacted they have either aggravated the evil where intended to prevent, or have fallen into contempt and uselessness, and been repealed."

Dan Voorhees.

"The Holy Scripture and the history of the church are alike without warrant for the Prohibitionists. And looking to the history of civilization from the days of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob to the present hour, where can a nation be found of strength and progress whose people could not be trusted to regulate their personal daily habits for themselves?"

Ex-Governor Russell, of Massachusetts.

"I believe the proposed amendment to the Constitution is inexpedient, unjust, wrong in principle, and, if adopted, will be injurious in its consequences. Prohibition has been enacted in this state, thoroughly tried, and repealed by its sponsors as a confessed failure."

Roger Q. Mills.

"I oppose the adoption of prohibition because it violates a fundamental principle of free government."

Senator Coke, of Texas.

"Prohibitionists assume that the citizen is incapable of personal self-government in respect to the use of alcohol, and would put a guard over his mouth to see that none enters. Their theory is at war with the theory of our government. They are sapping and mining the very foundations of our free institutions in denying the power of the citizen to govern himself and his appetite, for upon the existence of this power depends the stability of our government."

Sam. Houston.

"Before the evils of intemperance can be suppressed by legislative enactment natural laws must be repealed. As long as the soil produces fruit and grain ardent spirits will be manufactured and used as a beverage. To declare it to be a crime to manufacture and drink wine in moderation would, in effect, accuse Christ and the Holy Apostles of sinful practice. The first miracle of our blessed Saviour was the manufacture of wine out of water."

Senator Sherman.

"The contest for ages has shown that the attempt to regulate the appetite of people cannot be successful. The sooner any community appreciates that the better, and no party can carry that load on its shoulders and succeed very long. We have got to get away from such nonsense."

DRUNKENNESS IN MAINE.

The following is an excerpt from the Machias Union of Aug. 18, 1903. The Machias Union is one of the oldest established papers

in Maine. This old standard journal used to have many subscribers in Port Gamble and Seabeck several years ago, and it has some in Seattle yet:

Maine may not be the most drunken state in the Union, but it is one of the most—that is, if we are to believe what is said about it. It appears that those simple souls among us who had thought Maine to be one of the most sober and decent instead of bacchanalian and riotous must awake from their dream to the dreadful reality. People have come in here to observe the workings of the Maine law and have gone away and said things before, but they have been discounted as the utterances of prejudiced persons or paid emissaries of the liquor interests. These statements continue to be repeated, however, until the very insistency of them, if nothing more, compels attention.

The latest writers on the subject are two men, one Maine born and bred and the other hailing from far away. Let us first consider what the stranger says. He is George W. Peck of Milwaukee—not George Washington, but George Wilbur—famous journalist and humorous writer, whilom mayor of the city of beer, whose patron saint is Gambinus, and governor of Wisconsin, but known most widely perhaps as the brain father of Peck's Bad Boy. Well, the author of the Bad Boy has been visiting in Maine, a chiel among us takin' notes to be printed in a Milwaukee paper. Some of the things he says about the people of Maine, their characteristics and industrial conditions are neither flattering nor accurate, but chiefly interesting is what he says about the liquor traffic and the drinking habits. We find his statements in a condensed form in the Boston Transcript. "Dodging drunken men in Portland becomes monotonous. He found more arrests for drunkenness in Bangor—a city the size of Oshkosh—than in Milwaukee, with its third of a million of inhabitants. It struck Mr. Peck as pitiful to see work-

ingmen in the parks about Bangor on Sunday in so demoralized a condition from bad whiskey. Rockland he describes as a "pretty tough town," with little attention paid to the liquor laws, and with no particular tightening up of the facilities for getting drinks, except for a day or two at a time, when the Sturgis law officers happen to be around. He describes the express business which has grown up in the state, by which the citizen transmits an order by telephone, to be executed in Boston, and within fifteen minutes the goods are delivered at his door, brought as if by magic from a city four hundred miles away.

Bangor may speak for herself—besotted Bangor, with more arrests for drunkenness than the great metropolis—but when the ex-mayor of Beertown tells us that he found it monotonous "dodging drunken men in Portland" it staggers credulity. The other who exposes, through a popular magazine, the extraordinary prevalence of drunkenness in Maine, is one to the manner born—Holman S. Day. Here is an excerpt:

Arrests for intoxication the past year in Maine cities averaged $25\frac{1}{2}$ to the 1,000 of the population; in Portland arrests were over 55 to the 1,000, and in Bangor 100 to the 1,000. The average for all of New England is only $18\frac{1}{2}$ to the 1,000.

In considering the ways for getting liquor, we come to the so-called kitchen barrooms—places where strong drink is dispensed in the homes, and in Lewiston, where they flourish most rankly, there are hundreds of such places. There is no regulation of them. The veriest toper who has the price can buy. The quality of the liquor dispensed can hardly be described. Chemists who have analyzed some of it after its capture by officers say that it is composed of alcohol, tobacco steepings and stupefying drugs. Much of this stuff is compounded in Maine, and the makers of it buy labels, corks and caps in New York or Boston, and produce a neat "long necker" of apparently good whiskey. Many victims of this stuff

have died after being arrested for intoxication, and men apparently crazed by the compound have hanged themselves in their cells.

I am advancing no arguments from these statements. I am simply mentioning some facts that may be interesting to those unfamiliar with conditions in a state that has been practising prohibition—in its statutes—for fifty-seven years. Visitors to Maine always have occasion to speak of the prevalence of drinking on railroad trains in the state. The passed bottle is universally seen in smoking cars. In rural communities various patent medicines are used as intoxicants, and “jaky drunks” are common. The last is the Maine name for a Jamaica ginger jag. Men will drink down bottle after bottle of that fiery stuff.

OPEN LETTER TO JULIUS KRUTTSCHNITT

The Shameful Crime of Don't Care.

To Julius Kruttschnitt:

Dear Sir: Your extremely interesting correspondence in one of our national magazines, of very recent date, concerning the “enormous loss of life and the maiming of such a frightful number of people every year by railroad accidents,” should attract the attention of all thoughtful people. Constant readers of “The Patriarch” know quite well that I did not wait until a distinguished man in railroad cricles, like yourself, came into the public forum before writing, time and again, in very severe language, during the past seven years, upon the reckless destruction of life in the United States of America. Your published statements, my dear sir, are corroborated by my public writings

in this paper upon this vital matter: it is **the public**, and not the railroads who are the most to blame. The matter of **DISCIPLINE**, of which you justly complain, covers nearly the whole ground; and you very naturally are very desirous of knowing the **CAUSE** of this "undisciplined" condition." This "undisciplined" condition is confined entirely to America; no other nation on earth has it. "Don't Care" is the National Crime which has brought us to this murderous condition. We have "sown the wind, we are reaping the whirlwind." To present these facts is a very unpleasant task for me. I sincerely wish that my statements in this vital matter were untrue, but they are true, very true, ignominiously true. We have been trying, and are still striving, to live a lie; and the "frightful punishment" we are receiving is in consequence of our temerity and "undisciplined" condition, warns us in tones of thunder, coming from that sacred mystery of the Great Unknown, which declares that the first of all Gospel is: that a "lie cannot endure forever." **Race Suicide** is the parent of our "murderous life in America," for a people who will murder their offspring before they are born will be indifferent to human life after it is born. This is as truthful an indictment as it is shameful. Is the "Railroad Company" answerable for this? Nay, indeed not. If it was confined to the railroads alone we could soon rectify it; but it is national in its "Murderous Career" of wickedness. All branches of our industrial life bear its proportion of this national shame and

wickedness against the human race, against high heaven, against God, if you will. The Devil is in comamnd of America, and he is shouting in order to cover up his wickedness, **Prohibition! Prohibition!! Prohibition!!!** Street cars, mines, steamboats (on the inland waters) the holocausts of public schools and theatres, hotels, lodging houses, public platforms, scaffolding upon buildings whilst in construction, shooting each other to death in the woods whilst out hunting, three thousand injured this year on the "Fourth," and a large number killed. All! all!! are in the Great American cauldron of "murder," stimulated on, and on, to "premature death" by the spirit of **DON'T CARE!** and to add to this wicked but exciting condition, and add to the "rapidity" of it all, the "auto" has appeared upon the scene, and is eclipsing all other methods of "destroying human" life, in proportion to the number it carries. We, for many years past, have made "prizefighters wear gloves," in order that the brutal part of the gladiators shall be softened, and then if the notorious couple get into the ring for "big pay" and do not "slug each other" in the "most brutal manner," to the entire satisfaction of the "blood-thirsty audience," the Chief of Police steps in and informs the "sluggers that they must slug," or he will stop the fake. In the desire for "human blood" we are following closely upon the heels of the Romans in their degeneracy." When they were so satiated with wholesome sports as chariot racing, foot-racing, jumping, etc., etc.,

they hungered for greater excitement; so one gladiator was pitted against the other, and they fought each other with short swords, and it was left to the "turning up or down of women's thumbs to determine whether the vanquished gladiator should receive the death thrust or not;" they were also "race suiciders" at this period, for as St. Paul said to them: "The men do not after their kind, nor the women after their kind," and they threw him into a dungeon to perish for having the temerity to tell them the truth. * * * In regard to the "undisciplined" condition of which "Julius Kruttschnitt" complains and wants to know the Cause: This "undisciplined" condition is traceable to the public schools. Women are in charge of them, and women cannot mold the character of manly men; nor can she "discipline robust boys." So, having been too long at school, under the gentle effeminate treatment of women, he, when he finds himself subject to the authority of a man, it becomes very distasteful to him, and he is more ready with his gab to argue the point with his employer than he is to obey orders. "Discipline" is irksome to him, for the reason that he was never subject to it, especially at the hands of a man. In this "undisciplined" condition the "loafers' brigade" becomes more attractive to him than honest industry, and as his gab has been well developed by being kept too long at school, when he should have been at work, he becomes active with his gab, and is an ideal socialist, anarchist, prohibitionist or woman suffragist. As the

whole country is overstocked with "educated fools," trying to live by their wit, there is no field for him; work steadily, he will not; he has never been trained to it; so he turns card sharp, burglar, train robber, sneak thief, etc., etc., and eventually lands in the penitentiary, a victim of "too much education" under woman's tuition. Well "disciplined" men with valorous character is of more importance to a nation than abnormal education. We have normal schools, conducted by women for the purpose of creating abnormalities.—The Patriarch, July 11th, 1908.

"WELFARE WORK"

on

AMERICAN RAILROADS.

The Y. M. C. A. vs. Saloons.

Last July we received a booklet issued by Appleton's Magazine entitled "The Public's Responsibility for Railway Accidents," by Julius Kruttschnitt. Last week we received another booklet issued by the Review of Reviews, October number, entitled "Welfare Work on American Railroads," by William Merkel. All thoughtful people should read both of these productions carefully.

Now, Julius Kruttschnitt is a distinguished railroad official, being the director of maintenance and operation of the Union Pacific System and the Southern Pacific Railway Company, this being the case, he knows what he is talking about when presenting his personal knowledge and experience for public consideration. Thus

he is entitled to greater confidence when he presents his personal knowledge than the ordinary observer, who is often prompted by ulterior motives when discussing important events of great consequence to the public. Our readers will remember an article in "The Patriarch" of July 11, 1908, being an open letter to Julius Kruttschnitt, written and published in connection with the able article of this distinguished railway official. This gentleman presents eight causes of accidents, and he does not connect a single one of them with drunken habits or saloon influence. If the railway accidents were due in the least degree to the drink habit he would surely have said so, but here is what he does say:

"The cause lies in the fact, which cannot be denied, that the efficiency of railroad employes has deteriorated in the past few years. And this deterioration cannot be compensated. A railroad is much more dependent upon its human than upon its material equipment for safe and efficient operation. No matter how generously every material equipment is provided, how lavishly capital is expended for improvement of roadbed, additional side tracks, terminals, safety devices, and the like, the otulay is useless unless the road is efficiently manned. It is therefore altogether regrettable that the attitude of our employes has been changed. That it has been changed from loyalty and consideration to indifference if not to disloyalty, no observer will deny."

This is a very serious and no doubt a truthful indictment. Now comes William Menkel, a politician, who can with his clever sophistry lie every time he tells the truth, with some negative inuendoes and much positive truth, in his very able and attractive article in the October

number of the Review of Reviews, entitled "Welfare Work on American Railroads." In this interesting and instructive article he points out the liberality of the railroad company toward their employes, and the large amount of money spent by them for the entertainment and instruction of their employes when off duty. This liberality and its commendable aims should challenge the admiration of all people who can appreciate worthy efforts. But, alas for the vain efforts when actual experience rebukes the best of efforts. Following are a few clippings from the article of William Menkel:

The Y. M. C. A.'s Part in the Work.

To the Young Men's Christian Association belongs the bulk of the credit for pioneering efforts in behalf of railroad employes. Some of the roads run their own welfare institutions, but by far the greater part of this work is conducted by the railroad department of the Y. M. C. A. The first railroad branch of the association was established at Cleveland in 1872. Five years later the International Committee of the Y. M. C. A. took charge of the work and has given it careful supervision ever since.

.

While the smaller Y. M. C. A. buildings contain only the essential equipment for rest, refreshment and recreation, the larger establishments boast all the luxurious features of the big city clubhouses, with their libraries of many thousands of volumes, swimming pools, bowling alleys, and athletic grounds. Of course, all these fine privileges are not to be exactly without money and without price. The men pay a membership fee ranging from \$3 to \$5 a year, which includes all the general privileges of the buildings, such as the use of the library, reading room and writing room, while for meals, beds and baths there is a slight charge, barely covering the cost. The buildings are open day and night, and meals and baths can be had at all hours.

In the United States and Canada there are now 174 of these railroad Y. M. C. A.'s, with a membership of 93,000, and buildings having an aggregate value of \$3,569,200. These figures are constantly increasing.

In competition with the railway clubs, the saloon, which was formerly the only place the men had to go, has proved a failure, the best testimony to this effect being found in the consistent opposition of saloonkeepers wherever clubs are located. There is the same freedom in the railway club that the men formerly found in the saloon—and a great deal more comfort. No ironclad rules are made. The men meet on an equal footing.

An interesting example is the "Railroad High School."

A more worthy effort was never planned or carried out than that of the "**Y. M. C. A.** (with the assistance of the railroad companies) **vs. the Saloon**" on American Railroads, for the purpose of promoting the welfare of the employes and the enhancement of the public service at the same time. But what is the result of all this worthy effort but disappointment, chagrin, disaster? We question very much if the whole world's history presents such an object lesson as this, where **theory** supported by worthy people has been routed by **actual practice**. Please observe that the **Y. M. C. A. vs. the Saloon** movement began in 1872 in Cleveland, until now it has reached the number of 174 Y. M. C. A. establishments on American railroads, and saloons have been driven off altogether in many places, and they have been driven into the background in nearly all other places, and yet our murderous career on the railroads have in-

creased year after year, keeping pace with the increase of Y. M. C. A.'s, and as Julius Kruttschnitt says in the above clipping from his valuable article, "the efficiency of railroad employes has deteriorated in the past few years." This is a humiliating experience, and is disappointing in the extreme. He who can fathom this riddle of sobriety and irresponsibility and succeed in doing something effective for the saving of human life on American railroads will be the greatest public servant that has ever yet appeared in all our history. To think that we should murder tens of thousands annually, and maim hundreds of thousands in the same length of time, which does not happen in any other country on earth, in spite of the best efforts to save human life, looks like a national chastisement from the Omnipotent God. "What shall we do to be saved?"

It is quite evident that the efforts of the Y. M. C. A. has been worse than useless. I do not say this in a spirit of disparagement to the worthy efforts that have been made by them. I am merely giving my verdict according to the evidence. With our rash speculation we are teaching the world more of what to avoid than of what to adopt. There is one extremely interesting fact which has developed in America during the past half a century, and has become very apparent to me (as we have it now in all its fierceness) in the last quarter of a century. That an abnormal stimulation of the mind dulls the sensitiveness, or I might say the activity, of the heart, and when the heart becomes deadened then "moral obligations" will be indifferently

performed. Thus we see that that branch of activity (the intellectual) of the Y. M. C. A. has been attended with disaster to the public service on the railroads, as it stimulates the mind and leaves the heart as dormant as the devil could wish it, so we see that the Y. M. C. A. "drunkards," who are "drunk but not with wine," have been closely associated with more murder upon the railroads during the worthy efforts of the Y. M. C. A. than they were when the railroad employes got physically drunk upon "bad whisky" at the saloons. To simple minds that have been burdened with artificiality from the high schools this assertion, supported as it is by the most positive evidence, will be repudiated with all the vehemence of a self-assertive prohibitionist. The prohibitionist cares nothing about evidence. His ideas of virtue are speculative theories, supported by sanctimoniousness and political petticoats. He is a true exemplification of the following truism:

"Convince a man against his will,
He's of the same opinion still."

When a man gets drunk upon bad whisky (such as flows freely in all prohibition districts) he gets sick. This is his punishment, and it happens at irregular intervals only. But he whose mind is burdened beyond his natural capacity to bear at the high school of the Y. M. C. A. is constantly encouraged to carry a "heavy load," such as the professor can carry easily, until he gets so mentally drunk that he is morally irresponsible. This article is written

by the editor of this paper, and is published for the purpose of arresting the attention of thoughtful people with warm hearts and moral convictions. Educated fools will not comprehend it, as it is entirely out of the rut of popular belief and popular defects. "Though thou shouldst bray a fool in a mortar among wheat with a pestle, yet will not his foolishness depart from him." He with no warmth of heart "don't care," and we are having our hellish experience of slaughter upon railroads from the degenerate spirit of "don't care," which is going hand in hand with coercion-prohibition-damnation, being a philosophy from hell, mistaken by fools for wisdom and morality. That mandate of the railroad company forbidding their employes **"to drink on or off duty"** represents the insolence of an "imperious taskmaster," and its observance by the employes represents degradation, subserviency, humiliation, subjugation. No part of Europe would tolerate for a moment such imposition. The Emperor of Russia would never dare to issue such an infamous mandate, and if he did a general uprising would take place. The former boast of America was **character**. What has become of it? The 174 Y. M. C. A. resorts on American railroads are replete with educational inducements, and all kinds of entertainments prevail. The mind is continually exercised, but the **character** is subordinated. It is dormant. Character is worth more to a nation than education. There is not a self-respecting Rooseveltian in all that large army of railroad em-

ployes who submit to dictation concerning their **private life**. If this tyrannical despotism added to the efficiency of the public service it might be tolerated, or even encouraged as a policy, but the experience of 36 years prove that it does not; in fact, it is going hand in hand with inefficiency. Mr. Julius Kruttsnitt, one of the greatest of railroad officials, in his article has so declared. There is one very important lesson presented here. It is this: **The freest man is the BEST SERVANT!!**

HEARST.

“A tree is known by its fruit.”

“By your works ye shall be judged.”

William Randolph Hearst, judged by his works, has been a friend of the people. He is and has always been democratic. Being a man of great inherited wealth—not wealth accumulated by himself from exploiting the people—he seems to consider himself a trustee of this wealth for the people.

He supports a law bureau to defend and protect the people. Against the ice trust, the gas trust, the coal trust and the Ramapo steal the common people were powerless. They cannot as individuals fight these oppressive and robbing combines. Hearst with his money and the power of his papers comes to the assistance of the people. He employs able and high-priced lawyers and puts up the costs for a hard legal battle with these thieves. He succeeds and the poor people do not have to freeze in winter, nor perish from heat in the summer.

His victories over the ice, coal and gas combinations are only some of his triumphs in the interests of the common people.

For years he has through his powerful papers contended for better economic conditions—has fought against “the system” and our present irrational money-breeding legalized economic conditions—economic conditions that are making the rich richer and the poor poorer, and drawing our entire population into a class of the vicious and vulgar and irresponsible rich, and a class of the miserably poor—the rich as a class and the people of the abyss.

If these efforts bring him honorable notoriety and fame, he is entitled to it. This is certainly much nobler than to seek office by alliance with “the system” to get funds for corruption of the ballot.

To be Mayor, Governor and President is a laudable ambition. Every man has a right to aspire to leadership and office, and has the right to advertise and popularize himself by doing good and effectively serving the people whose support he wants.

Mr. Hearst has shown his political creed by his works, while other aspirants attempt to proclaim their creed by mouth. Of course the subsidized press of “the system” thinks this awful. “The system’s” papers think he ought not to do it—that he is a traitor to his class—that he is educating the people and may work a change in economic conditions. The people may cease to submit humbly and peaceably to legalized robbery.

Mr. Hearst in an open field fight—the mayoralty election—conquered Tammany so completely that Tammany almost en masse came over and have joined the forces of their conqueror. This may be strategy on the part of Tammany. The Tammanyites may hope to disintegrate and destroy the army they have for the time joined. But General Hearst has already shown that he is in command and General Murphy must obey orders or march out.

All honor to Hearst's method of advertising, and success to him in his honorable ambition and laudable aspirations.

E. C. McDOWELL.

—Patriarch, Oct. 20, 1906.

THE TWELVE APOSTLES OF SEATTLE.

“Male and Female Created He Them.”

WREATHS FOR THESE

W. P. Trimble, 2,334.	John Cort, 1,726.
E. C. Macy, 2,202.	Wm. Sutherland, 1,674.
Hi Gill, 2,157.	Mrs. M. B. Baxter, 1,580.
A. L. Cohen, 1,911.	John L. Wilson, 1,356.
Frank McDermott, 1,898.	W. H. Moore, 1,137.
C. D. Hillman, 1,792.	James P. Agnew, 908.

The above are the winners in the Star's "Wreaths for the Living" contest, which closed at noon today.

All morning the ballots piled into the Star office. Messengers and friends of candidates kept up a steady stream with their bundles of ballots.

W. P. Trimble went up to the top with a whoop, but at his heels was E. C. Macy, of the postoffice. The ballots came in in all shapes, neatly done up in bundles of a hundred, and quite the reverse in bundles thrown together in any old way.

The labor of counting the ballots was more than anticipated, but they were finally all tallied.

One envelope with 21 ballots, with no name, either of a candidate or the sender, was received.

On Monday, November 9, the Star will begin the publication of the obituaries of the successful candidates, one a day, in the order in which they appear above.

The following are the votes received by the other contestants, who are not included in the twelve:

Dr. M. A. Matthews, 906; Edward Clayson, Sr., 879; Jacob Furth, 617; John H. Miller, 582; John Slattery, 312.

None of the other candidates received over 100 votes.—Seattle Star.

We buy a copy of The Star on the streets nearly every day, read the news rapidly and the editorial also—with the same haste. That's all. Strange as it may appear, that the above announcement: "Wreaths for the Living," had run eight days before I saw it, and I should not have seen it then, only an acquaintance called my attention to it. The above "Twelve Apostles" are fairly representative of "Seattle's Experts," who are not entirely exempt (some of them) from "ballot-box stuffing." About the only three philosophers amongst the twelve are "High" Gill, John L. Wilson, "Billy Sutherland." As "Edward Clayson, Sr." received 879 votes (not a single one of whom are known to him) he barely escaped the ordeal of being one of the twelve "Questionables," and Dr. Matthews "escaped by the skin of his teeth," as three more votes would have made him one of the "elite." He now is with his peers—the five notables—instead of being one of "The Twelve Apostles." There are not less than "fifty editors" in Seattle, when we include the whole bunch, and Edward Clayson, Sr., editor of "The Patriarch," is the only one (John L. Wilson, one of the twelve, is not editor of the

P.-I., but the he is the owner) of them all that was brought forth from his "Tub of Diogenes" and placed in the forum amidst the celebrated, and notorious, the famous, and the infamous, the degenerate, and the regenerate, the politicians, and the statesmen, the gentle and the brutal, the modest and the pompous, the true and the false, the noble and the ignoble, the honest and the dishonest, the "Don't Cares" and the "Do Cares." The Kernel of the Seattle Daily Crimes" also ran. He got 17 votes. These 17 votes were, no doubt, from his great admirers—the quack doctors, and the cuckold makers. "The contestants," says The Star. We object! There were "contestants," without a doubt, but a man who is utterly ignorant of anything that is going on, cannot be considered as a "contestant" in that which he knows nothing about. It is anything but gratifying to be considered as being "in a race" with the "mere rich" man for public honors. "Trimble," for instance; the purveyor of petticoats and cock-a-doodle trinkets, or "Illman," the real estate shark, or "Queen Bee Baxter," the Semiramis of Seattle, or "Billy the Blessed," he with a "record." Nay, nay! They are not in my class. I cannot get down to their level, and they cannot raise to mine. Cumtux?

CUCKOLDRY AND PREACHERS.

Churchanity vs. Christianity.

RICHMOND HILL, Sept. 9.—The marriage of Rev. Dr. William H. Lawrence, pastor of Trinity Methodist church of this place, to a woman who had previously been divorced was sustained by the official

board of Trinity church in resolutions adopted. It was announced officially that after investigation the board had found that Mrs. Lawrence had divorced her former husband before Rev. Dr. Lawrence ever paid court to her. The resolution adopted by the board extended churchly love and fellowship to the pastor and his wife, exonerated each from any blame and expressed unshaken confidence in the pastor.

There they stand, in all their nakedness. The Methodist church as usual—the “fig leaf” is removed, without qualms of conscience.

“When nations are to perish in their sins,
’Tis in the church the leprosy begins.”

Now let “cuckold-makers” rejoice and flock to the Methodist church for absolution. They can now “lay the flattering unction to their souls” that they are exemplary Christians according to the canons of the Methodist church. Lawyeress Brown should join the Methodist church in the interest of cuckoldry and religion.

Miss Petticoats is the title of a new drama which is being extensively advertised at present. Now, we would like to suggest a title for an appropriate drama of today—“Miss Breeches.” “Mr. Petticoat” would be a very appropriate title for the bearded effeminates who are clamoring for women to bear the burdens of government for which the bearded effeminate is incapable. Let us have “Mr. Petticoat” by all means.

Since Robley D. Evans retired from the Navy profanity has fallen off in that branch of Uncle Sam’s service nearly fifty per cent.—San Jose Times.

And masculine virtue has gone with it.

GAMBLERS' PHILANTHROPY

vs.

CHURCH TEMERITY.

(“Special Privileges to None.”)

It appears that a clause in our “Anti-Gambling Law” was inserted for the “benefit of the Churches.” Such being the case we republish the following in order to present to the public what some Churches do in the interest of morality. They can learn lessons in common decency from the gamblers in this respect:

From a Distinguished Author.

“The Epworth Leaguers of Suffern, N. Y., have been conducting a very successful leg-show in the name of the Lord. The Devil’s monopoly of the opera-bouffe is broken—sawdust is henceforth to be a means of saving grace, a pair of pink tights hath become our new Ark of the Covenant. It appears from a dispatch to the St. Louis Republic, that the salary of the local Methodist minister was sadly in arrears and the earnest efforts of the board of stewards failed to bring the promises of the godly to par. Then the young ladies of the League took the matter in hand and raised the money with a rush by the simple expedient of lifting their petticoats and displaying their limbs. They evidently considered it a case in which the end justified the means. According to the dispatch, a curtain was stretched across the stage, behind which the young ladies stood, attired in high-water skirts. The drop was lifted until the audience was given a good view of the symposium of legs, which an auctioneer sold to the highest bidder the privilege of escorting to supper the proprietress of each pair of underpinning. When the bidding lagged the curtain was lifted a little higher, thereby enhancing the enthusiasm of the audience. What was the limit of the game—where the line of vision was drawn—we cannot gather from the dispatch; but it assures us that “the bidding grew highly spirited as the curtain rose a trifle at a time.” The language of the auctioneer is not reported, but we may fairly infer that he discoursed substantially as follows:

“Now, young gents, how much am I offered for the society of this lovely pair of limbs? A foot like

Trilby's, the proudly arched instep which proclaims a high-stepper and rapid goer, ankles that would make Psyche stay in out of the wind, and calves like rollicking Durham two-year-olds. Plhidias nor Praxiteles had such a model as he got in his graft on the Carian marble. How much for the blessed privilege of cantering her out to the banquet board, the envy of all your fellows, the observed of all observers? Two dol—what! Do me ears deceive me? O chivalry, where is thy blush? O manhood, where thy shame! The stage manager will lift the curtain another inch while the choir chants a verse from the Song of Solomon. Three dollars I'm bid for this empress of physical perfection—and our beloved pastor's salary unpaid! Three'n a quarter—n'alf! Now you talk. Come again! Observe the symphony of her garters, and come to Jesus. Think of the holy cause in which you're blowing yourself. 'N'alf'n'alf, three fifty, make it four! Silk stockings, too, and going at three 'n'alf, last call, and sold to our dear brother in Christ, Deacon Two Good, who will please claim his lovely prize, steer her against the lone oyster in the soup and fill her with hot house strawberries at a dollar a box."

We are told that the sale was "a great success." Of course it was. Few of the young Endeavorers had seen what Parkhurst saw or felt what Parkhurst felt. The sight of well-filled stockings and embroidered garters gave 'em a new sensation—made 'em sorry for the poor pastor and determined to give their all to the church. I'm growing a trifle grizzly, but had I been present I would have hypothecated my umbrella rather than that a young lady whose "limbs are like melodies," should miss her supper. The dispatch states that at the close of the evening the Endeavorers, male and female, voted that they'd had a bang up good time. If they didn't it was certainly not the fault of the young ladies. Of course they had a good time. With religious enthusiasm and pie on a thousand plates, legs and red lights all served up in one grand ollapodrida of Christian Endeavor piety, the veriest pessimist would find life well worth the living. Suffern, New York! Suffering Jehosaphat! Why didn't they send for the "Apostle" and let him get in the push? I would have fairly gloried in helping that distressed minister out of the hole. I once crossed the state of Missouri to attend a sale of sacred kisses to help "capture the world for Christ." Three Dakota widows, as many sure-enough relicts and a dozen corn-fed country maids with breath as sweet as that of

a nursing calf, were lined up inside the sacred edifice, waiting for the fray. I reached St. Peter ahead of all competitors—I mean the old fellow who kept the keys of this terrestrial Paradise and corralled the cash. By paying 25 cents you secured a permit to kiss a maid, 35 cents entitled you to brush the honey dew from the rich red lips of a divorcee while the brand of yum-yum ladled out by the sure-enough widows cost half-a-dollar a dose—all for Christ. I counted the kisses and bought a stack of whites, reds and blues that would enable me to play the game to the limit, and proceeded to shuffle the cards. The first one on the program was a widow who seemed to have been long waiting for something of the kind to happen. She came to the scratch with the esprit of the Old Guard chiseling desolation into the Dutch. She certainly served the Lord with all her heart and with all her soul. She said I was bashful because I didn't kiss her back. But there was no occasion for it—she had her face with her. By the time I had played in my stack of chips—had passed from Alpha to Omega—I felt like a drunken bumblebee in a field of red hollyhocks. I was convinced that religion is a good thing and decided to become a minister and enjoy its sweet consolation all the time. I went broke in the sacred cause and hypothecated my silver watch for more funds with which to carry on the holy crusade against the world, the flesh and the devil. I again started on the circuit, but the bloom had been brushed off the peach. I tasted everything, from stale beer and plug tobacco to moustache wax and bad cigars. It was like rooting for sweetness in the garbage barrel. I cashed in my chips at half price and spent the evening at a stag party trying to get the taste out of my mouth. The plan of salvation seemed to have been tampered with. I remembered that St. Paul commands Christians to greet each other with a kiss, and decided to take my hell hereafter.

I supposed that "holy zeal" had reached its limits when the church began to sell sanctified kisses; but it seems that I was mistaken. Piety, it appears, is progressive. It began with petty gambling—with ring-cakes and grab-bags—has finally reached the leg-show level and is still rolling on. What next? I can think of nothing but chuck-a-luck with loaded dice, or the dancing of the can-can in *puris naturalibus*. Is our religion returning to those old pagan revels wherein subter-brutishness was considered the noblest worship of the Deity? to the Bacchic orgies, in which impediments were cast aside and

law supplanted by license? Is the Jehovah of the Jews to be degraded into another Dionysus, and a phallic emblem submitted for the cross? The kissing match and leg show are certainly long strides backward toward that crass paganism wherein religion was little more than foolish ceremony and unbridled libidinosity. The Christian Endeavorers of Suffern, New York, should either take a carbolic acid bath and repent them in sackcloth and ashes, or relinquish their high pretensions and open a variety dive. Even at the French Vaudeville girls are not put up at auction. They may be displayed on the stage for the purpose of tempting young men to "take them to supper," but they are permitted to choose their own companions.—Patriarch, August 31, 1907.

BRYAN VS. HEARST.

In the Court of Public Opinion.

ATLANTA, Ga., Sept. 12.—William R. Hearst, when shown William J. Bryan's denial of Hearst's statement that Bryan four months ago proposed to support Hearst four years hence in return for Hearst's support in this campaign, made the following statement:

"I don't see why Bryan is always proposing policies that he has to recant, saying things that he has to retract and doing things that he has to deny. When Bryan came to New York some four months ago I did not call on him, as I had nothing to see him about. He did call on me, as he apparently had something to see me about. I kept his visit secret, but Chanler, in his suit against me, stated in his affidavit that he had seen Bryan at my house, and so the visit was inadvertently made public. That visit was without result, as I purposely avoided politics. Shortly afterward I received an invitation from a friend of mine to dinner. When I went to the dinner I found Bryan. After the dinner Bryan stepped aside with me in the hall and said exactly what I said he did. I wish he had not said it. I was surprised and humiliated by the proposition. It showed that Bryan had no appreciation or conception of the work

I had done for him or of the reason I had worked so hard and made so many sacrifices in the cause. It showed that he considered me merely a traitor working for some personal advantage or promotion in politics. I left the house humiliated, as I say, but more than ever opposed to Bryan, more than ever convinced that I was right in opposing him."

The present dispute between Hearst and Bryan was occasioned by a remark made by the New York editor in a speech in Atlanta last night. Hearst's remark was: "Bryan alleges that I am angry with him because he did not support me for the presidency at St. Louis four years ago. That is not true. If Bryan thought I was not the most available candidate it was his duty to oppose me. But if Bryan thought I was not the proper candidate he should not have approached me in New York four months ago with a proposition to support me in the next convention if I would support him in this campaign." Bryan when asked today at Cumberland, Md., about Hearst's remark answered: "The statement of Hearst is absolutely false in every particular. I met him at his house and also at the house of Dr. John Cox some time last fall or winter, but at neither place nor anywhere else was there any conversation that could by any possibility be distorted into such a proposition."

Now I ask in all sincerity that my readers will read the above very carefully, and then think it over thoroughly, and then consider if you were on a jury which one of these two, Hearst or Bryan, is the liar? Here is direct evidence given by Hearst and supported by the strongest "circumstantial evidence." There is also direct evidence from Bryan against Hearst, "unsupported by circumstantial evidence." Please observe the situation intelligently. The "circumstantial evidence" is very

strong in support of Hearst. The "circumstantial evidence" of Mr. Hearst has a very truthful, straightforward significance. Truly does Mr. Hearst say that "he did not seek Mr. Bryan, but Mr. Bryan sought him," and Mr. Hearst "kept Mr. Bryan's visit to him a secret," and it was only through a "suit in court by Chancellor" that Bryan's visit to Hearst was made public. And again Mr. Hearst was "invited to dinner by a friend," who was also a friend of Bryan. It is evident that the friend purposely invited Hearst to this dinner in order that Bryan should meet him in "any manner he saw fit," secret or otherwise. The public man should be indicted in the public press for any "one instance of duplicity," but Mr. Bryan has been a continuous falsifier for several years. **Tom Watson**, the truth seeker, the truth finder and truth promulgator, has indicted W. J. Bryan of being a falsifier and a wretched deceiver for years, and who, knowing the two men, would not believe the bare word of "Tom Watson" sooner than the oath of W. J. Bryan? This "experience" of Mr. Hearst with W. J. Bryan merely corroborates the "experiences" of other prominent and responsible men with the "Great National Demagogue of Nebraska." Here is another one confirming the shameful duplicity of Mr. Bryan:

Three popular places in Seattle—Dr. Matthews' church, the **Bismarck**, and the **Tannaeuser Cafes**. Cumtux?

"BULL DURHAM" WITH A MORAL.

(Pretentious Prudery.)

Bull Durham is a choice tobacco as Durham is choice stock, and Durham is a choice butter.

The manufacturers of Bull Durham, in order to attract attention to their famous brand of tobacco employed a very noted artist to paint a "Durham Bull," in all his "natural beauty." There he stands! A physical production of great beauty, presented by the skill of the artist with every appearance of "Rooseveltian virility," with all his masculine parts complete, noble in peace, fierce in war. But a "race suicider," a he prude, thought he saw an opportunity to display his effeminate pretense to modesty and exquisite "culcha" by making complaint (on the quiet) against this work of art, which ornamented the conspicuous places in this city, so some one went quietly to work and applied the "fig leaf" in order to cover the bull's nakedness, thus mutilating the picture. Suppose that it had been Cow Durham instead of Bull Durham and the artist had painted her, as in fly time, with her tail on end, exposing her female form; then what? Would they tie a grind-stone to her tail in order to make her behave?

Did these impious mockers ever attend an agricultural fair and witness the bulls, boars, stallions, cocks, dogs and rams to be found there for exhibit and admiration? When the photographer takes the pictures of these choice selections of Nnature's handiwork, and man's improvement, and places them before the public in large papers of general circulation, does he "mutilate" the picture by eradicating any portion of their anatomy?

It is more than likely that these great "moral complainants" of Seattle have been educated in that most wretched standard of all wickedness—"race suicide"—by reading "Queen-Bee Baxter's articles written in support of the infamous "Hallet Bill" which was introduced in our state legislature four years ago for the purpose of "casterating masculine virility." I wonder if these contemptible, hypocritical pretenders to modesty and morality, ever eat butter? Do they not know that the cow might eat her fill daily of choice clover and sweet grass, but that sweet butter could never be produced without the bull performing his male functions? Do these city jades (of both sexes) presume for a moment to say that they set the "moral pace" for the tens of thousands of farmers' wives, and daugh-

ters to emulate? This "Bull Durham" mockery of city jades can be jerrred at, and laughed to scorn by all farmers' wives and daughters, with the greatest propriety. Those papers which set up a roar a few weeks ago in this city about the "Durham Bull" would, if the "Bull Durham Tobacco Co." had patronized them instead of putting up their own pictures, have presented the Bull in the most conspicuous manner in their paper with his horns, his tail, his hoofs, his ears and his "male adornments complete," and there would never have been a squeal, and what an admirable picture it would have been in comparison to the detestible quack doctor who appears in these papers continually; the one is a beautiful brute, and the other is a brutal human. Cumtux?

An honored member of our present legislature has introduced a "bill" for the purpose of **suppressing the quack doctor**. He is right, but no member of the legislature has had the immoral temerity to introduce a bill for the purpose of "**mutilating a bull**" before he is permitted to be placed on exhibition at a "stock show" in this state, in order to comply with base minds and corrupted morals of the "effeminate" order. Now take your medicine! and hide your hypocrisy from the face of virtuous people, who appreciate both natural beauty and "Rooseveltian virility" of the "moral and strenuous" type.

We ask in all sincerity if a few good breweries and distilleries would not be a godsend to the people of Maine, both materially, morally and physically? Where hypocrisy reigns supreme the people will be punished. This is evident from experience. Hypocrisy usurps the functions of morality in Maine, and the whole commonwealth suffers in consequence. There are quite a number of Seattle's best citizens who came here from Maine, and they will confirm this statement. Shall we permit this prohibition blast to establish itself in the State of Washington?

PERSONAL LIBERTY LEAGUE.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

We are in favor of the proper observance of the Sabbath, but not of laws that restrict the right of the individual citizen to indulge in innocent amusements and harmless recreation on that day.

We are in favor of the licensing of saloons and their proper regulation and control, but not of prohibition.

We believe in the subordination of the interests of the individual citizen to the interests of the community as a whole, but not in the curtailment of the personal rights and liberties of one class or party of citizens to satisfy the demands of another class or party who may desire to waive such personal rights and liberties for themselves.

Believing in the above principles, we declare our friendship and pledge our support to men and measures that stand for these principles, and we declare our opposition to men and measures that favor sumptuary or restrictive legislation which encroaches upon or curtails the personal liberties of our people.

The vote of Jimmy Durkin for governor of the state, upon the Democratic ticket, is in reality the greatest surprise of the late election. This "unique candidate" came within one thousand three hundred votes of being elected. "The Patriarch," as far as we saw of the press of the state, was the only paper that gave him a prominence, without being solicited or paid for the same. This very large vote of a "saloonkeeper" for governor, is ominous. It must make the "Anti-Saloon League" feel sick, as it is a reflection in a large measure of the public sentiment on the saloons.

Seattle, Aug. 24, 1904.

Edward Clayson, Sr., Editor Patriarch:

Dear Sir—Accept my thanks for a packet of **The Patriarch**, received yesterday. Every page gives evidence that intellectual and moral issues are placed above material interests. With your views, as far as I have learned them, I heartily agree, with one reserve, viz., the saloon question, on which your position is not clear to my mind. . . .

Wishing success to your paper, which strikes me as on a higher plane than any local paper I have seen, I remain, yours respectfully,

W. A. P. MARTIN,

Ex-President Imperial University, Peking.

The above letter from Dr. Martin, the most distinguished missionary that ever visited Seattle, gives a wholesome rebuke to the hypocrites who turn up their noses and exclaim: "Ho! **The Patriarch** is a 'whisky man's paper'." I sent Dr. Martin a whole package of **Patriarchs**, selected indiscriminately. He does not prostitute his intelligence, nor violate the highest standard of good morals by endorsing a paper of **exemplary moral worth**, just because it stands by the "liquor dealers," as against hypocritical pretenders. The only reserve made by Dr. Martin in relation to "the saloon question" in his letter to me, is a very gentle one, as he says the position **The Patriarch** takes upon the saloon question is "not clear to his mind." This shows a liberal spirit which is open to conviction.—**The Patriarch**, Sept. 16, 1905.

HIGH COMPLIMENTS.

That editorial "Jap Morality" in the 23rd inst. **Patriarch** is not excelled by the English Quaker Jonathan Dymond (1803) in any of his

classic essays on "English Ethics and British Morals." Having said this, and truly spoken, nothing more remains. Good old Dr. Dymond, rich though he was, covered the entire field, leaving room only for his addenda, made, and so opportunely made by **The Patriarch**, concerning which latter a Kentuckian some time ago said: "People may damn this paper now, but ten years hence many of the ideas it now advocates will be current coin."

S. PARRISH, Attorney.

Richmond, Ky., Sept. 28, 1905.

—**The Patriarch**, Oct. 6th, 1905.

Department of Justice—Office of United States
Attorney for the Eastern District of Wash-
ington.

Spokane, September 19, 1908.

Mr. Edward Clayson, Sr.,

"**The Patriarch**,"

1320 Arcade, Seattle, Wash.

Dear Sir: I am in receipt of the copy of "**The Patriarch**" of the 12th instant, containing your editorial comments on the paper which I read at the meeting of the Washington State Bar Association at Seattle, and beg to thank you for the generous praise which you bestow upon my effort. I was greatly interested in your comments and particularly in those on the fact that I had not carried the subject, or rather its discussion, far enough. That I did not do so was not because I had not considered the precise suggestions which you make, but because I felt that I had already departed suffi-

ciently from the conventional and usual form of addresses delivered at prior meetings. There is a surprising lack of effort on the part of the people at large to teach specifically concerning morals in the broad sense of the term, and I sincerely hope (though there is no remarkable amount of encouragement for so doing) that the day is not far distant when it will seem of as great importance in institutions of learning, and those kindred, that the young be taught to do and live right as that they should be made proficient in the sciences and arts. Your vigorous remarks lead me to believe that you likewise hope for such conditions.

Again thanking you for the kindly consideration which you have given my paper, I am,

Very truly yours,

A. G. AVERY.

---The Patriarch, Sept. 16, 1908.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 027 273 667 4

WHITE & DAVIS
PRINTING CO.

PRINTERS
ENGRAVERS
BINDERS

ARCADE WAY
SEATTLE